The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1892.

The Week.

MR. BLAINE'S letter announcing that he is not a candidate for the Presidency has been so generally discounted that it will not cause any sensation. Every well-informed person has known since his break-down last May that he was physically incapable of filling the Presidency, and that the excitement of a campaign would be more than he could safely encounter. It has therefore been only a question of the time when, and the manner in which, he would announce the fact that his name would not go before the Convention. He has put off writing the letter as long as he could, and when he did write it he made it as curt as possible. There is not even the slightest reference to the Administration of President Harrison, and it is easy to perceive the writer's attitude of contempt towards his nominal chief. All that he has to say, after thanking his friends for their confidence, is that he is sure they will "make earnest effort in the approaching contest, which is rendered specially important by reason of the industrial and financial policies of the Government being at stake"; and that "the popular decision on these issues is of great moment and will be of far-reaching consequence." Indeed, the letter is as short and tart as it could well be made.

After taking two weeks to think it over, the acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Spaulding, has concluded that he must reckon in the Treasury statement the expenses on account of the national-bank fund, and so he now admits a deficit of about $250,000 for the first six months of the fiscal year, instead of the surplus of $7,000,000 which he reported to the Ways and Means Committee on January 23. On that date, he also admitted that the cash in the Treasury used for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the sinking fund had not been included in the expenditures. He said that about $10,000,000 out of the "apparent surplus of $24,000,000" would be needed to provide for those requirements. Last Saturday he stated that during the first six months of the fiscal year $29,986,256 had been turned over to the sinking fund. Secretary Foster, in his annual report, estimated the total sum which would be needed for that purpose at $48,913,025. So here is a discrepancy of about $10,000,000 between him and his subordinate. We recur to these conflicting statements to show how impossible it is to accept any of them as exact, and in what an insecure condition our national finances now stand.

Those solemn editors who profess not to be able to see anything funny in the inglorious close of the late unpleasantness with Chili, ought to read the current debates in Congress. The surest way for any speaker to raise a laugh is to make some reference to that case of acting under the duellist's code without abiding by its rules. Republicans, too, resort to it as well as Democrats. Thus, Congressman Bowers the other day, in defending the Billion-Dollar Congress, gave a humorous turn to his remarks by saying that, but for the large appropriations, we should not have been able "to send an ultimatum to the Indians in Patagonia." The laughter which such sallies evoke in the House and in the country in general is really one of the best proofs the Chilians could have that this nation at heart cherishes no unkind feelings towards them. If there had been any genuine war feeling in the country, it would not have blown off as it did, in a hearty guffaw and a sense of relief, when it was found that the President was able to get in a threat of war only by turning his back on assurances of peace and rushing to the fray with his eyes shut. We hope that Minister Montt and the other intelligent Chilians now in the United States will not fail to observe how conclusive this evidence is, or to point it out to their countrymen. It is safe to say that, outside of politico-naval circles, and apart from boys and those who take the boyish view of a war, there was absolutely no sentiment in this country in favor of fighting Chili for any of the real or imaginary offences alleged against her.

Ex-Senator Ingalls added one more to his cynical exposures of Republican schemes in the remarks he made in Chicago last week about the real purposes of the Warriors. He said that "the supposititious trouble with Chili was manufactured by people who have a direct interest in securing a big appropriation from Congress to build an expensive, useless, unnecessary navy. It was the annual war scare which is gotten up by those same people just about the beginning of every Congress." There has already been a good deal of justification for such an opinion in the quiet laying of fingers alongside noses indulged in by navy contractors, and in the haste with which a naval appropriation bill has been introduced in the Senate. Nor can there be any doubt that Ingalls reflects a great body of public sentiment in the West in his further observation:

"A navy will only get us into trouble, just as the *Baltimore* did. There is no necessity for this country sending a lot of war-ships swaggering around the earth saying, 'The United States must be respected!' The United States is respected without any bullying of that sort. Nations are like individuals. A blustering fellow who goes around with a revolver in his hip-pocket and a bowie-knife down his boot-leg, is more apt to get into trouble than a quiet citizen who goes unarmed and minds his own business. The United States does not need to play the rôle of a 'bad man.'"

Many of the Western Republicans in the last Congress were very reluctant to vote for the increased naval expenditures. In fact, some of them did at first vote against the increase, and it was not until the *Tribune* had lectured Mr. Peters and the rest of them for their "prairie idea of a navy" that the bill went through. We think that the ridiculous finale of the Chilian imbroglio will considerably strengthen the prairie idea in the present Congress.

We find in the Washington despatches to the *Times* a fresh example of the kind of things the navy is ready to do for us now that it has no chance to bombard Valparaiso. It is described in these words:

"Probably the only chance of getting Mole St. Nicolas is to wait for the next Haytian revolution, which can be counted upon to occur before long, and then make the cession of the Mole the price of recognition by the United States of one side or the other. That is practically what was done at the time of the last revolution, but Mr. Douglass let it get away from him. In case such a bargain is made again, it is probable that immediate possession will be taken by the United States, and no opportunity will be given for the Haytian Government to back out of its contract."

This has the true piratical ring. Wait till your neighbor is in trouble and then seize his property. There is just one improvement that we could suggest, and that is to stir up some trouble in Hayti in order to make a pretext for taking the property. There is generally one Government of Hayti on that island and another on some neighboring island—Jamaica for example. Why not go to the latter government and make a bargain to put it in power on condition that it hand over the Mole St. Nicholas to us? This is about the same thing that Mr. Douglass tells us was done before, and might have succeeded had we not been pushing a steamship-subsidy job on the Haytian Government at the same time. Of course we should not make the mistake the second time of having an over-scrupulous Minister at Port au Prince.

Mr. Hill continues to neglect his duties as United States Senator at Washington, and spends week after week of the session at Albany, in order to "set up" the caucuses which will send delegates to his "snap" convention of February 22. The attention of the whole country is called to this shameless performance by the proceedings in the Senate on Monday. It was the day set for action on the nomination of a postmaster for Elmira, the Senator's home. He had objected to the President's choice, and had asked to have consideration of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the important matter postponed until he could be present. In accordance with the demands of "Senatorial courtesy," postponement was twice granted. When a third request for delay was made on Monday, and the Senate was asked to wait until the 24th of February, when the midwinter convention would have been held, even his Democratic colleagues were so much disgusted that they refused to comply with the impudent request, and final action in the matter was taken. As though to emphasize Hill's flagrant neglect of his duties at Washington, word comes from Albany that he has had to leave the quarters which he had taken in a respectable private house there, because the decent people who live in it could not stand the goings-on of the gang of political "strikers" who are his only visitors, and that he has had to go to the Delevan House, where he is appropriately quartered in Tweed's old rooms.

The simple facts about Mr. Hill's career are, that he learned his first lessons in political methods from a man who was first dismissed from the Union Army and was afterwards a convict; that his chief weapons in political warfare have always been bribery, trickery, and party treachery; that he has habitually formed his political alliances with the worst elements of society; that he has from his earliest manhood to the present moment never associated with the respectable elements of society, but with the base and depraved; that he has conferred the public offices within his gift upon the men who were most willing and unscrupulous in doing his political work; and that the theft of the control of the State Senate, with which he has ended his career as Governor, is the logical and fitting culmination of a busy lifetime of political crime. That such a man should presume to offer himself as the candidate of a great party for the Presidency of the United States is the most astonishing event in our political history. Nothing approaching it has ever happened before, or is likely ever to happen again, for it is preposterous to assume that the experiment can meet with anything except overwhelming rebuke and failure.

We understand that the perplexity of the Tammany and Hill people over Gov. Flower increases daily. They say they have to watch him in eight-hour shifts, lest by some bad blunder, committed when alone, he should in some manner damage the great cause they have at heart. They nominated him, doubtless, knowing he would be subservient, but they now see that there is such a thing as too great subserviency even in a tool. He may at any moment, by some display of excessive and foolish zeal in their service, still further aggravate the difficulties of their position. But he can hardly do worse out of his own head than they have made him do already. The appointment of Mr. Maynard to the Court of Appeals was undoubtedly imposed on him by the Mentors. Mr. Flower would hardly have thought of it himself; and yet what a stupendous piece of folly it was as a preparation for a meeting between the Democracy of New York and that of other States. Nothing approaching it in flagrancy has been perpetrated in this part of the world in the worst days. As bad judges as Mr. Maynard have sat on the judicial bench in this State, but not on the bench of the Court of Appeals, and as bad judges as he have got nominations, and have been elected by the people in ignorance or indifference. But no Governor has ventured to *appoint* such a man to a seat in any court of record.

It is good news that an investigation of the Pension Bureau is at last to be undertaken in earnest by the Democrats of the House. It is one of the worst scandals of the Harrison Administration that a discredited politician like Raum should have been retained as the head of this important department of the Government after conclusive evidence of his gross unfitness for the place had become public, despite all the efforts at concealment and whitewash. An official exposure of his misdoings ought to force action even from a President who does not believe in dismissing a man when he is "under fire." An equally searching investigation ought to be made into the no less notorious and discreditable management of the Census Bureau by Porter. That shrewd spoilsman has done his best to avert trouble by giving a good many Democratic Senators and Representatives slices of the "pork," but we shall not believe until we are forced to do so that a House with a Democratic majority of 150 will let him off for that.

Besides the advantage of economy in money which the new bill to regulate the Government printing proposes, an economy of the patience of those who read the *Congressional Record* is also contemplated. The economy in printing is to be brought about in various ways, such as the prevention of duplicate printing and reprinting. Senator Gallinger brought out the fact that the entire Blair Bill was printed seventeen times in the House during the last Congress, having been introduced by seventeen different members. Such an outrageous practice is to be cut off. More than that, a great saving is to be effected, if the bill passes, in the mere form of reporting motions and the action thereon. One of the official reporters of the House has made a calculation which shows that in the last Congress 131½ columns of the *Record* were filled with useless verbiage in regard to the single motion for "reconsideration" in the House alone. The case is as bad with many other stereotyped forms which it is proposed to give authority to the printers of the *Record* to reduce to the simplest terms. Indeed, Senator Sherman went so far as to suggest the employment of an editor of the *Record*, authorized to wield the blue pencil mercilessly. He admitted that the position would require "the most courageous man in America," and feared that even so he would be killed off within a week. The discussion was of value, at any rate, in drawing public attention to the immense heaps of rubbish that leave the Government printing-presses only to rot in the basement of the Capitol or in junk-shops, and in showing the ease with which, as Mr. Sherman observed, the annual printing bill could be cut down by from one to two million dollars.

There has been extraordinary delay on the part of the protectionists in identifying and locating the "hundreds of new industries" brought into existence by the McKinley tariff, and in reporting cases where it has caused a rise in wages. This delay has been naturally attributed to the non-existence of the necessary facts, and we were, therefore, somewhat surprised that the Syracuse *Journal*, in reporting an increase of wages at the works of the Solvay Process Company in that city, did not make the usual protectionist claim. The manufacture carried on by that concern resembles to some extent that of a blast furnace, the works being necessarily operated continuously, and it has been the custom for the men to work in shifts of eleven and thirteen hours. Recently, however, the company issued a notice to its workmen to the effect that, "in appreciation of the long hours of work and of the faithful service of the shift-workers," and desiring "not to be outdone by others in caring for the welfare of its employees," it proposed to make three shifts instead of two, the men to receive 9¾ hours' pay for eight hours' work. The change, which was submitted to the workmen's vote, involves the employment of about 25 per cent. more hands, and an increase in the amount of wages paid of about 20 per cent. The reason why the glory of this change has not been attributed to the tariff appears upon examination. The products of the concern are soda-ash, caustic soda, and bi-carbonate of soda. The McKinley Act left the duties upon the two former products unchanged, and reduced the duty upon the bicarbonate from 1½ cents to 1 cent a pound. It looks as if the managers of this concern thought it more profitable to apply their money to the payment of increased wages than to contributions to the Wanamaker and Quay campaign fund.

Morris, the Louisiana lottery man, is learning the disagreeable lesson that nobody trusts the word of a gambler, no matter if he be a millionaire. The anti-lottery people in his State are inclined to regard his letter, which ostensibly aban-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dons the fight for a new charter, as only a ruse to secure the withdrawal of the opposition to the lottery; and they think that the supporters of the lottery expect to secure a majority of the Legislature to be elected in April, when they will at once call a Constitutional Convention, frame a new Constitution for the State, chartering a lottery company, and declare it adopted without submitting it to the vote of the people. For this reason the anti-lottery party will keep up its fight as determinedly as though Morris had made no announcement. Both parties, moreover, are preparing for the spring election as though it were to be a battle, and consignments of weapons are arriving by steamer at New Orleans for distribution through the State.

Meanwhile the thing to do is to secure the passage by Congress of the proposed law taxing lotteries so heavily that nobody will hereafter be able to make them profitable. If Morris & Co. propose, as they apparently do, to keep at work until the end of 1893, the law is needed immediately for effect in their case. It has been hastily assumed by some people that the recent decision of the Supreme Court, declaring the constitutionality of the anti-lottery law passed by the last Congress, put fresh obstacles in their way. As a matter of fact, however, the law has been in existence and has been enforced for a year and a half. It undoubtedly reduced the profits of the lottery, but they were still large enough to make it worth while for the managers to offer $1,250,000 a year for a new charter—an offer which was, of course, made with the knowledge that the Supreme Court might render such a decision as has just come from it. It needs to be supplemented by a tax-law such as has already been introduced. Even if Morris and his associates were to surrender now, such a law should be on the statute-book as a warning to all that lotteries will not pay hereafter in this country.

A Corrupt Practices Bill has been introduced again in the Massachusetts Legislature. The first appeared in 1889, and, like its successor in 1891, passed one house of the Legislature only to meet its death in the other. The present bill is substantially the measure which was presented last year, only a few unimportant changes having been made in its provisions. It relies solely on public opinion for its success in practice, as all its provisions relate to the securing of enforced publicity of expenditures. All campaign committees or organizations are required to have treasurers, and to keep detailed accounts of all moneys, securities, and equivalents of money received, and of the manner in which the same is expended, and to publish sworn returns of both receipts and disbursements after election. Every candidate is required to make similar returns. No limit is placed to expenditures by candidates, as is proposed in Senator Saxton's new bill, but blank forms are given in which the exact amounts expended for all the most familiar campaign uses must be set down. The Supreme Judicial Court and the Superior Court are given full equity powers to compel delinquents to comply with the law, and to advance such proceedings upon their dockets.

Mr. Chamberlain's accession to the leadership of the Liberal Unionists in the House of Commons will give special prominence, no doubt, to his Socialistic schemes. He very likely had these in mind on Monday when he rubbed the vinegar into the wounds of his Tory associates by saying explicitly that he took the position of leader as a Liberal. His plans for better housing of the poor and for securing small leaseholds to tenant-farmers are apparently to give way, for the present, to his project of State pensions for the aged. On that subject he contributes an article to the February number of the *National Review*, in which he sets forth the details of his plan—a plan which is subjected to a most destructive criticism, from the financial and practical point of view, in the London *Economist* of January 30. In general, he would imitate the German plan of providing an old-age insurance for workingmen upwards of sixty-five years, by payments from an accumulated fund to which the workingman himself, his employer, and the State should contribute in equal proportions. He objects to the present system of post-office annuities that it requires payments which a great many laboring men, with only "a week's reserve between them and starvation," are utterly unable to make; but the *Economist* shows that, on his own plan, fully as large or larger payments would often have to be made.

Mr. Chamberlain is by no means the father of this scheme in England. Its history is detailed in the last number of the *Economic Review* by Mr. L. B. Sladen, who traces its advent in Great Britain to the indirect influence of recent German and French legislation, and directly to the agitations of the National Providence League, originated by Canon Blackley. In 1880 that organization was advocating a system of workingmen's insurance against both old age and sickness, and in 1885 a select committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider its proposals. The committee decided against the sick-pay plan, and this led the League to drop that part of the project. Canon Blackley's original scheme was to compel every person between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one to pay over to the State £10, while in return the State was to act as a banker and guarantee a pension of five shillings a week in old age. The obvious difficulty of compelling people to pay who did not want to has finally led the Canon to abandon that plan in favor of the German method. On the other hand, Mr. Charles Booth has brought forward a definite plan of pensioning aged workingmen by a system of national taxation exclusively. He estimates the proportion of paupers in the population above sixty-five to be 38 per cent.; but he uses the word "pauper" of every person who has received even the smallest parochial relief during the year—no more, for example, than a bottle of medicine; and he admits his statistics to be thus insecure. But he reckons that an old-age pension of five shillings a week could be paid in the whole United Kingdom, including working expenses of the system, for £26,000,000 per annum, which would demand an addition of 1.7 per cent. to the income tax. There is no likelihood whatever of such a scheme being put into operation, at least not until sufficient time has elapsed to judge fairly of the working of the German system. Prof. Geffcken has pointed out that the cost of the actual administration of that system is likely to be very much in excess of what was estimated.

The tendency of German tribunals to strain the law for the restriction of the liberty of the press finds another forcible illustration in the recent attempt of the prosecuting attorney in Berlin to make not only the type-setter and proof-reader (as was decided last year by the Supreme Court of the Empire at Leipsic), but also the machinist who runs the press, legally responsible for what a paper prints. In the present case the incriminated matter is a politically offensive engraving, for the existence of which the Imperial Government wishes to punish as many persons as possible in order to terrorize the censorious. According to the letter of the law, not only the author or editor of an improper publication, but also "the publisher, the printer, and any one who sells or publicly disseminates it," are regarded as culpable and may be called to account; but no mention is made of type-setters, proof-readers, or other persons performing mechanical functions in the production of the objectionable work, and it is evident that the framers of the law never contemplated such an application of it. This arbitrary construction of a legal enactment is based upon the forced interpretation of the phrase "causal connection," which might as well be pushed further and made to include the paper-maker, the rag-picker, the manufacturer of the press, and the printer's devil. Indeed, every purchaser of a newspaper sustains a certain causal connection with it, and might be implicated in its criminalities as an accessory after the fact. The incident has called forth indignant protests from the German press, and is noteworthy as indicative of the spirit that begins to prevail in high official circles at Berlin, as the result of the Emperor's influence, and threatens to corrupt the fountains of justice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HOUSE RULES.

THE debates on the rules of procedure of the House of Representatives have been marked by little of the acrimony and excitement which characterized the discussions of the same subject at the opening of the Fifty-first Congress. This has resulted partly from the fact that no such sweeping changes in the rules as were brought about by Speaker Reed were contemplated, and partly from the fact that the Democratic majority is so overwhelming as to reduce to a minimum the temptation to gain a partisan advantage by manipulation of the methods of legislating. Just here was where Mr. Reed made a great mistake. Conceding for the moment the force of all his arguments in favor of granting the Speaker power to count a quorum, the change was introduced at a time when, in fact, it did confer an immense advantage upon his party, and when it could not escape the imputation of being founded upon partisan considerations, and not upon an impartial desire to improve parliamentary practice. No such imputation can lie, except in one particular which we shall mention, against the present proposals of the Democrats in the House, since they have at command a two-thirds vote to suspend any rules which might stand between them and any desired legislation.

The rejection of the quorum-counting power of the Speaker was, of course, a foregone conclusion. Mr. Reed and his party colleagues advocated its retention, as was to be expected, and he, for the first time, we believe, took occasion to explain, or to attempt to explain, the flat contradiction between his expressed views on this subject in 1880 and in 1889. The explanation was little more than a grudging confession that he had changed his mind. But the debate on this question, though forced and spiritless, at least brought out and put on record the fact that the power of the Speaker to count a quorum was exposed to absurd mistakes and open to dangerous abuse. Mr. Reed himself admitted that one member of the Fifty-first Congress had been counted as "present but not voting" who was, in fact, not even "present" in the city of Washington at the time. The present Speaker was once similarly counted, when in reality he was in his room in the Metropolitan Hotel; and Mr. Reed made no denial of the assertion of Congressman Alderson: "I am here to say that the records of the Fifty-first Congress show that gentlemen not present were counted as present, and were not even permitted subsequently to have the privilege of stating in the *Record* that they were not present." From such absurdities, at least, the present House will be free.

Neither will Speaker Crisp be given the immense power conferred upon Mr. Reed in the preceding Congress by the rule which enabled him to refuse to entertain a dilatory motion. Left entirely to himself to determine what a "dilatory" motion was, Mr. Reed made a set of rulings on the subject which not only were contradictory, but even so seriously impaired the privileges of members as to refuse to allow them to correct the *Record*, to make a personal explanation, or to appeal from the decision of the Chair. This rule found no place in the recommendations laid before the present House, and was rejected when moved as an amendment by the Republicans. Yet a very strong rule was reported for the prevention of filibustering. It reads as follows:

> "It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules, and, pending the consideration, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but, after the result is announced, he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said report shall have been fully disposed of."

In the course of the debate on this rule a great deal was said by the Republicans about Democratic inconsistency. Here, they alleged, was the overriding of the rights of the minority so vehemently denounced when practised by a Republican Congress. Yet as they could not, if they were to be consistent themselves while charging others with inconsistency, object to the principle of the rule, their opposition was necessarily resolved into a taunt. As to that, Mr. Catchings of Mississippi said, doubtless with truth, that the repression of filibustering had long been desired in some form or other by the more experienced members of Congress. He said that "it was a matter of common talk among us on this side in the preceding Congress [the Fiftieth] that we were sitting here like children and babies." He had in mind such scenes of wanton filibustering as the Republicans indulged in to prevent Mr. Carlisle from being seated.

> "I assert," said Mr. Catchings, "that if the Democrats had carried the last Congress, there would have been a provision something like this. . . . I want to make another statement. The impression went abroad that in the last Congress the Democratic members of the House opposed the rules proposed by gentlemen on the other side because they sought to lodge the power in the Speaker, or somewhere, to bring business to an end when it had proceeded sufficiently long. I have gone through every debate on that subject, and I assert now that no gentleman who addressed this House on this side of the chamber uttered a single word which suggested that the House should be denied the power to close debate under suitable circumstances. The whole avalanche of debate on this side of the House was directed against the method suggested by gentlemen on the other side. My friend from Maine [Mr. Reed] smiles at my statement. I reiterate it, and repeat now that not a solitary word was uttered in debate by any gentleman on this side which sought to deny that the House should have this power."

That there is an essential difference between the rule in question and the method employed in the last Congress is perfectly clear. As Mr. Bland put it:

> "The rule of the Fifty-first Congress vested in the Speaker of this House the power to gag this House by his own ruling. That I would never do, or anything like it. . . . This simply says that the Speaker and his Committee on Rules may report to this House a rule by which legislation may be facilitated, and that question is submitted to the House itself, and not to the Speaker."

And Mr. Goodnight brought out excellently the nature of the rule as a club in reserve against the filibuster when he said:

> "For a long period in the proceedings of this body, power was vested in one man on the floor as the filibuster; in the last Congress it was vested largely in one man in the Chair as the Speaker. Here is the compromise—not to vest the power in the Speaker, one man; not to vest it in the filibuster, one man; not to vest it in the Committee on Rules, a set of men; but to vest it in the House, by authorizing the Committee on Rules to ask the House whether it is its desire to proceed with business and its desire that the filibuster be stopped."

The acceptance of Mr. Holman's pet rule admitting of "riders" on appropriation bills, provided they are "germane" and reduce expenditures, we must regard as unfortunate and mischievous. Whatever excuse for such a provision there may have been in the days of military rule in the South no longer exists, and we see no defence for it. It is an indirect way of doing what the House would not dare to do directly—that is, to say to a hostile Senate and President: "Consent to such and such legislation, or we will give you no money to run the Government." It may not be an unconstitutional proceeding, but it is certainly extra-constitutional, and therefore highly dangerous.

One excellent rule was moved as an amendment by Mr. McCreary, and accepted by the Committee on Rules, and says:

> "It shall be the duty of the several committees having jurisdiction of the general appropriation bills to report said appropriation bills (except the General Deficiency Bill) within eighty days after the committees are announced in a long session, and within forty days after the commencement of a short session; and if any committee fail so to report, the reasons of such failure shall be privileged for consideration when called for by any member of the House."

Mr. McCreary showed how this rule had been in force for twenty-one Congresses, but how, since 1880, the appropriation bills had been reported later and later, in July and August even, with the consequent blind rush and insufficient consideration which have marked the legislation of the last hours of so many sessions in recent years. If the rule is enforced, it will lead to a change in this particular greatly for the better.

Also worthy of commendation is the rule urged by Mr. Dingley and finally accepted by the Democratic majority, giving immediate consideration to any bill returned from the Senate with amendments, instead of sending it to the foot of the calendar.

AUTHORITIES IN PRACTICAL POLITICS.

WILL there be, twenty years hence, anybody left in this community who will receive any attention as an authority touching the drift of public opinion or the probable result of any State or Federal election? In view of the astounding blunders made every year on these points by men who cultivate most carefully the art of political forecast, it is difficult to answer this question in the affirmative. There has probably never been a man in this State who cultivated practical politics more carefully than Tweed, in the two great political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kitchen gardens, Albany and New York, and yet he made a prodigious mistake concerning the amount of his kind of politics the public would submit to. Another illustration of this want of perspicacity on the part of an exceedingly keen politician—an illustration which we have already cited—is Mr. Reed's course in the Speaker's chair in the House. After extraordinarily good opportunities of testing the popular temper and taking the public judgment on his own work, he appears to have left the chair in October, 1890, and awaited the Congressional elections of the following month in a state of utter delusion about the (to him) most important political phenomena of the day. Mr. Blaine is another example of the same thing. No such training in the art of finding out where one stands in popular estimation has ever been enjoyed by any man as he has had, and he has had the aid of the shrewdest party augurs in the country. But, for all this, he evidently in 1884 did not know where he stood. He found himself weak where he thought he was strongest, and strong where he expected to be weakest. He cut down heavily the party majorities, for instance, in States in which the enthusiasm for him seemed greatest. We need not recall the error of the venerable Mr. Charles A. Dana of the *Sun* touching the vote in New York city in the Presidential election in that year, as that enjoys a world-wide fame, being an error of 129,658 in a total of 136,656. The annals of mathematics, to say nothing of politics, contain nothing like this. Coming down to the last State election, we find, too, one of the oldest and most skilful politicians we have still among us, Mr. George Bliss, making a mistake of about 70,000 in a total vote of 1,165,000. This error is not as large as a church door, and cannot approach the venerable Dana's, but it is enough to reflect unending discredit on a great reputation.

We might multiply these illustrations almost indefinitely. We use them at all simply to bring us to the case of Hill. Hill has had the longest career as a trickster of any man in the history of the State. There is no mode of doing it or not doing it, in the field of what is called machine politics, which he has not successfully tried. He has in this field apparently achieved all that Tilden achieved, without any of Tilden's aids in the shape of a high position at the bar, the possession of a great fortune, and considerable reputation as a reformer. He has during the past seven years passed with ease from triumph to triumph, each of them more open to public reprobation than the previous one, until finally he convinced a large number of respectable men that, "say what we will," he, and not Cleveland, was the man to retrieve the fortunes of the Democratic party in this State. He persuaded hundreds of these people that his powers of trickery and intrigue, known as "management," although known only in this State, were a far more valuable possession to the party in the nation at large than Cleveland's prestige as the first candidate under whom the party had won in twenty-five years, and the first leader to furnish it with a platform which had attracted tens of thousands of quondam opponents.

Within a few weeks, all this has been changed. It is now difficult to find a respectable man to do Hill reverence or to say a good word for him. Everybody seems to have lost confidence in his methods—nobody ever had any confidence in the man himself—and we are witnessing a movement, which will undoubtedly be successful, against him as a politician who would lead the party to its ruin next fall. Now all that he has done to merit this downfall has been to keep straight on in the course he has been pursuing for the last seven years. Not a single departure from it has he made. Everything he has been doing at Albany during this period was a natural and legitimate preparation for the selection by himself exclusively of the State delegation to the National Convention, and, having this power of selection, it seemed proper, or of little consequence, that he should fix the period of electing them. Consequently, we have no doubt that he feels some honest indignation to-day at the proposal to strip him of his powers and dismiss him from the party service in disgrace.

But, what is the mistake he has made? Why, exactly the mistake that Tweed, Blaine, and nearly all the other Bosses have made, or are sure to make in the long run—the mistake of supposing that because the public stand some things from a politician, they will stand everything. One of the most valuable elements in the success of all the political charlatans on both sides is the absorption of voters in their private affairs, and the unwillingness to turn aside to take part in fights that are not likely to be decisive. This is now an old story. We claim no originality for it as an explanation, but it does explain a very large number of American political puzzles. It is almost impossible to get men in a city like this to deal with a tumor like Hill in the beginning by taking medicine. They let him grow and grow till he comes to a head, and then they are astounded by their own supineness and lance him. But how unjust to our charlatans this is! Into what excesses it lures them! What damage, too, the prolonged success of such careers, with public condonation and connivance, must do to the ideals of the younger men who are thinking of public life. Hundreds and thousands in this State have already begun to admire Hill, and some to imitate him, with the permission, if not applause, of their seniors. How hard it must be for many of them to cleanse their bosoms of such perilous stuff, even after he has been found out and discarded.

FREE SILVER.

A MEETING of the free-silver members of the Coinage Committee was held at Mr. Bland's house on Saturday evening, at which it was resolved to report a bill in accordance with their views without delay. Notwithstanding this menace to the business interests of the country, the public mind is quite indifferent to the meeting, and also to the weekly meetings of the full Committee, at which testimony of one sort and another is taken on the silver question, and the old straw thrashed over for the hundredth time. The explanation of this indifference is that the people do not consider the free-silver movement at Washington serious. They see plainly enough that certain members of Congress are under the necessity of stirring around and making a show of activity for silver—all this for home consumption—but they see, also, that the Democratic party is not going to disembowel itself at the beginning of a Presidential campaign. They see, too, that, if it should do such a thing, free silver would not result from that performance during the present session of Congress. Hence the little interest that is taken in the meetings of Mr. Bland's Committee.

These committee meetings are worth following, however, since they show us what is running in the minds of the members. They had Mr. Leech, the Director of the Mint, before them the other day. While this gentleman was on the witness stand, Mr. Bartine of Nevada made it very clear that he wanted to have all the loose silver in the world, and all that comes into the world hereafter, "taken off the market" in order to improve the price. Among other queries put by Mr. Bartine was this:

> "Suppose there were none at all on the market, would that have an effect on the price?"

Mr. Leech was obliged to answer that it would have a decided effect, but when Mr. Bartine went on to ask what would be "the maximum price" in that case, he replied that he should not like to say absolutely. He thought it would depend somewhat upon the intensity of the demand. Pushed a little further by the Nevada member (who put the hypothetical case that the Government should buy *all* that was offered and hold it), Mr. Leech said that "It would probably remain at the price we paid for it." Mr. Bartine's curiosity was not even now satisfied, but he did not succeed in getting any figures that it would be safe to speculate upon. One of his queries, however, showed that he considered free coinage to be the same thing in effect as our buying all the silver in the world and all that may be mined hereafter. At least this is what we infer from the following question put by him to Mr. Leech:

> "Suppose there were open mints. I am putting a hypothetical question. The silver simply flows into the mints. There is nothing left in the form of bullion; and I ask you, in that case, upon what the market price of silver would be based?"

Mr. Leech referred his questioner to the country immediately south of us, and said that there was an open mint in Mexico,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but that that did not prevent silver from having a market price. Whereupon Mr. Bartine expressed surprise that anybody could compare Mexico with the United States. Besides, he said, Mexico is a silver-standard, not a bimetallic country. Continuing, Mr. Bartine said:

"The whole theory of bimetallism is this, is it not?—that under free coinage both metals, being coined, are thrown into the common reservoir of the currency, and just as long as they remain interconvertible, parity is maintained."

It is pleasant to have a short definition of the whole theory of bimetallism, and we must say that Mr. Bartine has given it to us in as few words as we could hope for. It prompts us to say that during much the larger part of the world's history—down to within a few years comparatively—free coinage existed in Europe and America, all the nations being engaged in "throwing the two metals into a common reservoir." Yet there was always a price for silver quoted in terms of gold, or of gold quoted in terms of silver, in the metal markets (a varying price), and, although they were interconvertible in theory, they were seldom so in fact. Parity was never maintained ten years consecutively either in France or in any other country.

What was running in the head of Chairman Bland was also made clear by the questions he put to Mr. Leech. He had an idea that the prices of commodities have been forced down by the demonetization of silver, and that the price of silver bullion itself has been forced down *pari passu* by the same cause. But when confronted with the fact that some commodities had not fallen in price at all, while some had fallen more than others, and that some had fallen and then had risen again, he took refuge in a grand average of "fifteen or twenty years," of which he appears to have the sole key. Mr. Bland did not tell Mr. Leech in what way his grand average decline in prices of commodities had been injurious to the laboring classes, or how they would be benefited by a general advance in the cost of the things they have to buy. He kept that secret also to himself.

Mr. Williams of Illinois appears to have had a gleam of sense during the examination of Mr. Leech, but whether it will do him any good or not is doubtful. He put this fetching question to the witness:

"If the value of the Treasury notes depends on the confidence of the people that they will be redeemed by the nation in gold, why not issue more greenbacks, instead of buying silver?"

Mr. Leech must have known that this interrogatory carried the whole philosophy of the silver question. He must have known, too, that Mr. Williams put it to him as an economical, and not as a legal, question. Yet he chose to answer it as though it were put to him in the latter aspect only. So he said, merely, "We buy silver under a law of Congress." But Mr. Williams was not entirely satisfied with this. So he asked: "Why would not paper money be just as good?" And again Mr. Leech avoided the point of the inquiry by replying that "the absorption of this large amount of silver by the Government has had a tendency to steady the price of silver." As this was not responsive to the inquiry of the member from Illinois, we will supplement Mr. Leech's answer by saying: "O wise Mr. Williams, paper money would be just as good, in fact better, since the national resources would not, in that case, be squandered in buying something which the nation does not want and cannot use. Granted the major premise that the paper outstanding based on silver is to be redeemed in gold, then is the silver itself useless, and worse than useless, for if it were not bought by Government, it would enter into our commerce and balance of trade, like wheat and corn and cotton."

UNBALANCED FOREIGN TRADE.

THE old phrases about "the balance of trade," and about the "favorable" or "unfavorable" nature of it, have not remained in persistent use in this country without good reason. Our economic system for the past thirty years has been based upon the fundamental ideas of the so-called mercantile system, and it is no wonder that it should have clung to the phraseology of that past stage of economic theory. Moreover, the statistics of our foreign commerce for many years have given much color to the view that exports and imports normally balance each other, since, in fact, they have generally come very near doing so. The totals of the two for a series of years come to about the same figure.

Of course, it is a truth, and a most important truth, that the exports of a country are paid for by imports, and so that the two, in a sense, must balance. But it is far from being true that such a balance will be revealed in the returns of commodities actually exported and imported. Yet it is this last which has been supposed to be true by publicists and writers in our country, and it is this which leaves them wholly aghast over the present condition of our foreign trade. According to the figures of the last four or five months, the excess of our exports over our imports amounts to something like $150,000,000. By the prevailing logic, this "favorable balance" must be paid over to us in gold, and the confident prophecy that a vast sum in gold was bound to come to us was made week after week by our financial authorities, all through the fall and early winter. Indeed, a suggestion, intended to be humorous, that the new navy ought to go and seize upon the gold Europe was keeping back from us, was seriously taken up by a Pennsylvania contemporary, which thus gave an unconscious illustration of the prevailing confusion of ideas upon the subject.

Prof. Bastable of the University of Dublin has a chapter on "Money and Indebtedness in Foreign Commerce," in his lately published manual entitled 'The Commerce of Nations,' and in it he discusses this whole question in a very illuminating manner. England, of course, furnishes the classical refutation of the "balance of trade" theory. For the last thirty-five years her balances of foreign trade have been steadily and enormously "unfavorable," and foot up for the whole period (1856–1890) the frightful sum of $13,250,000,000. On the theories now in vogue among us, and lately adopted in France, England should have been ruined several times over in the course of those disastrous thirty-five years, and all statistics and returns of wealth and taxation which go to show that, on the contrary, she has been growing richer all the while, should be set down as inventions of the devil or the Cobden Club. In addressing himself to the task of explaining this apparent anomaly in the statistics of trade, Prof. Bastable has attacked the hardest problem of the kind to be encountered anywhere, and the solution of it which he advances is well worth the consideration of those who are puzzling themselves over our own unwonted situation.

He begins by making the point that the usual and visible interchange of commodities between countries is not the only form of economic relation existing between them. For example, there are credit relations which make no figure in the returns of trade, and which yet powerfully affect the real status of the lending as related to the borrowing country. For many years the accumulated wealth of the United Kingdom has been flowing abroad and going into foreign investments. Now loans of that sort are, in Prof. Bastable's happy phrase, "an immaterial export." They go to pay in part for the excess of imports, not in the crude way of settling imaginary "balances," but in stimulating that prosperity abroad which results in increased shipments of goods to England. So far from arguing a disastrous condition of English trade, these increased imports only go to show how excellently English capital is employed in foreign countries.

Prof. Bastable also dwells upon the great influence which the industry of transferring commodities must have upon the wealth of those countries whose citizens engage in it largely. The services which they render in this way are also a kind of export. "A nation that possesses a share of the carrying trade of the world will so far have an excess of imports, which are the payment for the work done in this direction." Thus the excess of England's imports is naturally attendant upon her supremacy in shipping. The Professor asserts that careful observers give the sum of $300,000,000 annually as the amount that Great Britain can now set down to this account. He enumerates also several other circumstances that affect the course and figures of foreign commerce—such as remittances to absentees, Government payments abroad, earnings of for-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eigners sent home, etc. In short, he effectually disposes of the superficial idea that a country's international account can be accurately drawn from the books in the custom-houses, and, above all, stamps afresh the absurdity of the notion that it is a ruinous thing to get as big a price as possible, in imports, for what a nation has to sell in exports.

ANOTHER YEAR OF HARVARD.

A CLEAR note of progress and prosperity is sounded in President Eliot's annual report, just given to the public. More students than ever; greater surpluses here, smaller deficits there; no abatement in fresh endowments; marked increase in the collections of the great University Museum; new branches of instruction; further changes in the organization of the Faculty; a year added to the medical course—such are some of the evidences of good and even plethoric condition. For, on the other hand, how shall the multitude of students be cheaply lodged and fed? and what is to be done with an overflowing and overcrowded Library, with a Law School building already outgrown, and with law-books torn to tatters in the mad competition for the study of cases? In fact, even if immediate response were made to pressing needs, the time required for the slow process of construction is such that a period of embarrassment from excess of attendance and of growth is almost inevitable. But in this particular Harvard does not stand alone.

The accompanying official reports from the several departments afford a lively sense of the range of University equipment, studies and activity, and should be read by every educator, and by parents who wish to form their own opinion of Harvard. They are, of course, summarized in the President's report, but much of their impressiveness is lost in the process. We shall say no more about them, confining our remarks to a new appointment of a so-called Regent, whose functions are (for the college world) those of a chief of police and health officer. "He may also," says President Eliot, "exercise some salutary influence over students' societies." This is the only allusion to a recent attribution to the Regent by the Board of Overseers in consequence of an aroused public sentiment against a certain Greek-letter society at Harvard. That the public ought not to have expected the President to treat this subject directly and at length will appear from the fact that his report covers the year ending October 1, 1891—a date prior to the agitation against the D. K. E. We should ourselves refrain from reviving the discussion, temporarily closed by the action of the Overseers, if we felt sure that it would be noticed in the next annual report even by way of chronicle.

That the abuses exposed have persisted so long and so flauntingly may be explained in two ways: either the Faculty have felt powerless to cope with them, or they have disavowed responsibility for the morals of the undergraduates. That the latter position is tenable cannot be admitted. The compulsory prayers, now happily abolished, were clung to up to the last moment, for their alleged moral value; the voluntary services that replaced them are maintained to the same end, and a body of college Preachers has been created with a view to the closest possible ethical relations with the greatest possible number of students. The wholesome restriction and regulation of the athletic mania had a very large reference to the demoralization attendant upon student sporting contests—as in the opposition shown to the employment of professional coaches, etc. If the Harvard Faculty should imitate that of Yale in forbidding—or even discountenancing—the advertisement of liquors in the college papers, no one would think it an extraordinary interference. Or if, supplying a great desideratum, a hall should be built in Cambridge for student assemblies, and the Faculty should order all class dinners to be held there, and forbid wine as at the Commencement dinner, that, too, would seem only natural and salutary. In like manner it might legitimately throw its corporate weight against any attempt to revive saloons in Cambridge.

There was a time, some thirty-five years ago, when, secret societies having been abolished by the action of a class that deserves to be remembered, the Faculty ought to have resolved never to let them invade the College again, as it ought now, in our opinion, to repress every new one that raises its head. Societies whose end is secrecy have no place in student life, and produce incomparably more evil than good. They prolong both the childish age and the childish code of morals, which is essentially a savage code. The "running" and fagging exacted by the D. K. E., as illustrated in a late issue of *Harper's Weekly*, was submitted to from a perverted sense of honor such as small boys exhibit when they have pledged obedience to a domineering spirit among them. This "honor" led to public behavior such as dishonored breeding, family, and common gentlemanliness; and social prizes were actually awarded for rowdy dress and boorish antics. Even the crack athletes refuted the pretence that their pastimes foster manliness, by submitting to the degrading behests of fellow-members of the D. K. E., their momentary masters. As for the branding of the arm with cigar-stumps, it was, as a test of fortitude, on a par with suspension from the muscles of the back and breast among the Mandan Indians, as described by Catlin; and treatment hitherto reserved for cattle and slaves was courted or endured by the sons of freemen and gentlemen, the offspring of the highest culture, in an institution of the highest culture.

It is not our purpose to supply reasons why the Faculty have not long since made a determined attack on the D. K. E., or why they are content with concessions volunteered by a secret society alarmed by public exposure. We do not allege that the task is easy; but we are sure that it ought to engage the Regent (who may, however, well be a past member of the society in question), the college Preachers and Professors (some of whom are certain to be past members). What is easy, and has never been attempted, is to enlist *parents* on the side of the desired reform. Suppose we are told that if the evil thing is suppressed under one name, it will spring up under another, or that it will take on a still greater degree of secrecy, etc.; yet if its existence is merely suspected, the Faculty can denounce it and put parents on their guard. Such an intangible relic of hazing as "Bloody Monday" could have been reached by due warning. Let the Faculty proclaim a boycott, and every right-minded parent will take sides with it. The mode of doing this is of course by circular, and this the Preachers of the University have been allowed to use in support of their own special charge and interest. Why should the Faculty neglect to inform parents succinctly of the number, aims, and standing of student societies, with approbation or censure? Is it less proper or less important than to "advise" them "that eighteen years is a suitable age for entering Harvard College"; or to exhibit annually, in the Catalogue, tables of cost of living, with a more or less explicit admonition not to allow the student too much money for extravagant and corrupting misuse?

In several places in his report President Eliot intimates the leadership of Harvard among American colleges. It is on this account that we have chosen for comment a subject deeply interesting to the most of Harvard's sister institutions. As in the case of elective studies and voluntary religious devotion, the example set by Harvard affects, sooner or later, all rivals and aspirants; and this consideration should be a standing incentive to reform.

CARDINAL MANNING.

LONDON, January 21, 1892.

IN the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who has just passed away at the age of eighty-four, England has lost one of the most interesting, or at any rate one of the most singular, figures of this generation, and a man who has contributed a new type to her already wide and various ecclesiastical life. Without being a personage of the first order, he will nevertheless deserve a place in the history of his time, having effected what greater men might perhaps have failed to effect, and being, indeed, an instance of the dictum that it is by no means the men of greatest intellect who effect most.

The salient facts of his life are probably known to your readers. He was the son of wealthy parents, educated at Harrow and Oxford, where he obtained high honors and a Fellowship; presently an English Episcopal clergyman, who soon rose to be Archdeacon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Chichester, and, having by degrees been led further and further from his original Low Church position into the Tractarian Movement, ultimately, at the age of forty-three, went over to the Church of Rome. Having some time before lost his wife, he was at once re-ordained a priest, was appointed Archbishop of Westminster on Cardinal Wiseman's death in 1865, and raised to the Cardinalate by Pope Pius IX in 1875.

He was not a great thinker nor a man of conspicuous learning. In his writings there is neither originality nor any eminent logical weight and power; indeed, so far as purely intellectual gifts are concerned, he was not to be named with Cardinal Newman or several other of the ablest members of the Tractarian party, such as Ward and Dalgairns, who went over to Rome, and Dean Church, who remained an Anglican. Though he had won a high reputation at Oxford, he was not a leading spirit in the famous "Movement"; and he rose to eminence in the Church of England in virtue rather of his winning manners, his graceful rhetoric, and his zealous discharge of clerical duties, than of any commanding talents. Nor had his character the same power either to attract or to awe as that of Newman. Nobody in those days called him great; nobody felt impelled to follow where he led; there was nothing in him —either in his sermons or in his writings—which one felt to be majestic, or lofty, or profound. In short, he was not in the grand style, and wanted that note of ethereal purity or passionate fervor which marks the highest form of religious character.

Intelligent, however, skilful, versatile he was in the highest degree; cultivated, too, with a knowledge of all that a highly educated man ought to know, dexterous rather than powerful in theological controversy, an admirable rhetorician, handling language with that particular kind of art which Roman ecclesiastics most cultivate—an exact precision of phrase and a subtle delicacy of suggestion. He wrote abundantly and on many subjects, always with cleverness and with the air of one who belonged to the *âmes d'élite*, yet his style never attained high literary merit. There was no imaginative richness about it, neither were there the weight and penetration that come from sustained and vigorous thinking. Similarly, with a certain parade of references to history and to out-of-the-way writers, it gave little evidence of solid learning. He was an accomplished disputant in the sense of knowing thoroughly the more obvious weaknesses of the Protestant (and especially of the Anglican) position, and being able to contrast them effectively with the external completeness and symmetry of the Roman system. But he never struck out a new or illuminative thought; and he seldom succeeded in facing—indeed, seemed anxious to evade—a real difficulty.

What, then, was the secret of his great and long-sustained reputation and influence? It lay in his power of dealing with men. For the work of an ecclesiastic, and especially of an ecclesiastical ruler, he had three inestimable gifts—a resolute will, captivating manners, a tact equally acute and watchful, by which he seemed not only to read men's characters, but to discern the most effective means of playing on their motives. To call him a consummate intriguer would be unjust, because the word implies something dishonorable and probably also selfish, and the Cardinal was neither; but he had the talents which an intriguer needs, although he used them in a spirit of absolute devotion to the interests of his Church, and was too much of a gentleman to think that the interests of the Church justified any and every means. He had the art of seeming to lay his mind alongside of yours, anxious to know what you had to say, and prepared to listen respectfully to it, even though you might be much younger and of no particular consequence; yet you felt that he was watching you, and watching, in conformity to a settled habit, the effect upon you of everything he said. It was hard not to be flattered by this air of genial deference, and natural to admire the great man who condescended without condescension, even though one felt secretly disappointed at the want of brilliance or profundity in his conversation. Like his famous contemporary, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, he was all things to all men—possessed, no doubt, of far less wit and far less natural eloquence than that brilliant creature, but giving a stronger impression of earnestness and unquestioning loyalty to the cause he had made his own.

In the government of his diocese he showed himself a finished ruler and manager of men, flexible in his power of adapting himself to any character or society, yet inflexible when firmness was needed, usually gentle in his methods, but tenacious in his purposes, demanding rightfully from others the simplicity of life and the untiring energy in work of which he set an example himself. Over women his influence was still greater than over men, because women are more susceptible to the charm of a fine presence and fascinating manners; and no one could count so many conversions among ladies of rank, his ascetic face and dignified carriage according admirably both with his sacerdotal rank and fervid piety. So in his public appearances, it was neither the solid substance of his discourses or speeches that struck one, nor the literary quality of their style, but their happy adaptation to the audience, and the grace with which they were delivered. For this reason—originality or weight in the substance being of more relative consequence in the pulpit than on a platform—his addresses at public meetings were much better than his sermons, and won for him the reputation of a speaker whom it was well worth while to secure at any social or philanthropic gathering. At the Vatican Council of 1870 it was less by his speeches than by his work in private among the assembled prelates that he served the Infallibilist cause. Himself devoted, and, no doubt, honestly devoted, to Ultramontane principles, he did not hesitate to do violence to history and join in destroying what freedom the Church at large had retained, in order to exalt the Pope to a position unheard of even at Trent, not to say in the Middle Ages. His activity, his assiduity, and his wonderful powers of persuasion contributed largely to the satisfaction of the wishes of Pius IX., who promptly rewarded him with the Cardinalate. But the opponents of the new dogma, as superior in learning to the Infallibilists as they proved inferior in numbers, carried back with them to Germany and America an undying distrust of the astute Englishman who had shown more than a convert's proverbial eagerness for rushing to extremes and forcing others to follow.

But Dr. Manning's powers shone forth most fully in the course he gave to his policy as Archbishop of Westminster and head of the Roman hierarchy in Britain. He had two great difficulties to confront. One was the suspicion of the old English Roman Catholic families, who distrusted him as a recent recruit from Protestantism, a man filled with ideas unfamiliar to their conservative minds. The other was the aversion of English society, and indeed of Englishmen generally, to the pretensions of Rome—an aversion which, among the Tories, sprang from deep-seated historical associations, and among the Whigs drew strength from dislike to the reactionary tendencies of the Papal power on the European Continent, and especially its resistance to Italian freedom. Both these hostilities he overcame. The old families soon became proud of a prelate who supported with dignity and vigor the pretensions of their Church; while the suspicions of Englishmen generally were by degrees disarmed by the heartiness with which the Cardinal threw himself into moral and philanthropic causes. He was an ardent advocate of temperance, and did much to promote it among the poorer Roman Catholic population. He joined those who worked for the better protection of children and the repression of vice. He interested himself in what are called labor questions, did not recoil from proposals to limit by legislation the hours of toil, and willingly exerted himself to settle differences between employers and workmen, showing his own sympathy with the latter. Thus he won a popularity with the masses greater than any prelate of the Established Church has enjoyed, while the middle and upper classes noted with pleasure that, however Ultramontane in his theology, he always spoke and wrote as an Englishman upon non-theological subjects.

In all this there was no playing of a part, for he sincerely cared about temperance, the welfare of children, the advancement of the workingmen, and the greatness of his country. But there was also a sage perception of the incidental service which his attitude in these matters could render to his Church; and he relished the notion of proving that a Roman Cardinal could also be a patriotic and philanthropic Englishman. He saw the value of these things and used them, and, though he was not artful, he was full of art. Truth, for its own sake, he did not love nor seek, but, having once formed his conclusions, subordinated everything else to them. Power he loved, yet not selfishly, but rather to promote the objects he cared for. But to his church he was devoted heart and soul; nor could any one have better served it so far as England was concerned. No one in our time, hardly even Newman, has done so much to sap and remove the old Protestant fears and jealousies of Rome—fears and jealousies which some of us hold to have been more reasonable than the easy indifference and self-styled liberality of the present day will allow. Truly the Church of Rome is a wonderful institution, fertile beyond any other, since in its old age it can give birth to new types of force and brilliance. In Manning it produced a figure full of a kind of charm and strength which no Protestant body could have reared, a man who never obtruded a claim, yet never yielded one, who was the loyal servant of a spiritual despotism, yet apparently in sympathy with democratic ideas and movements, equally welcome among the poorest Irish of his diocese and at the gatherings of the great, ready to join in every good work with those most opposed to his own doctrines, yet standing detached as the austere and confident representative of an unbending, world-embracing power.

O. D.

THE ACADEMY OF FINE ARTS.—II.

PARIS, January 23, 1892.

DURING the reign of Louis Philippe the composition and the attributions of the Academy of Fine Arts remained as they had been organized by Louis XVIII. The other academies

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also continued subject to the same rule. The only reform which took place, and this was a return to the past, was the reëstablishment, in 1832, under the name of Academy of Moral and Political Sciences, of the second class, which had been founded in 1795, and had been suppressed seven years afterwards.

Louis Philippe, as I have said, had no great love for art. The restoration of Versailles was for him the occasion for encouraging Horace Vernet, who became his favorite painter. Horace Vernet had an admirable facility; he painted great historical battles with an extraordinary rapidity. The rooms which he filled with his canvases at Versailles are still visited by hundreds of people every year, and his pictures have preserved a freshness which is wonderful. Horace Vernet had no "system": he was not a pupil of Gros or of Gérard; he was a naturalist. He had made a special study of the horse, of military uniforms; he became the painter of the conquest of Africa. Louis Philippe formed the historical museum of Versailles with great celerity, and Horace Vernet's rapidity suited his purposes. The accounts published after the Revolution of 1848 of the civil list of Louis Philippe show that he had spent in 1848 nearly twenty million francs, wholly from this civil list, for the restoration of Versailles and for the works of art which fill its galleries. A splendid fête was given on the 10th of June, 1837, at the palace of Versailles, on the occasion of its inauguration as a museum. The five classes of the Institute figured in it, as well as all the artists, even the most humble, who had had a hand in the realization of the King's project. The "Misanthrope" and "Esther" were played in the beautiful theatre of the palace; Horace Vernet was the hero of this fête; everybody admired his beautiful pictures, which were a sort of illustration of the recent exploits of the French Army.

When the revolution of February broke out, the Academy was on the point of exercising one of its prerogatives, which was the selection of the works of art admitted to the annual exposition. This exposition used to take place in the rooms of the Louvre. The new Government applied in artistic matters the principles which had been proclaimed from the steps of the Hôtel de Ville: as the right of suffrage had been given to every Frenchman, all the works of art sent for examination in 1848 were admitted without exception. The result was deplorable: some of the pictures were not fit to become sign-boards. The principle of universal admission was abandoned, and ever since a special jury has had to be elected by the artists themselves.

The patronage of the Academy extended over the French School of Rome. All who have lived in the capital of Italy know the Villa Medici. In 1848 the Director and the young *pensionnaires* had to leave Rome; they were denounced as revolutionists and threatened by the *codini;* they took refuge in Florence, and returned to Rome only after the city had been taken by a French army. Horace Vernet was for some time director of the school of the Villa Medici; the post has always been much envied by French artists. Horace Vernet had Ingres for his successor.

The constitution and the privileges of the Academy were, on the whole, respected by the Republic of 1848. It was reserved for the Second Empire to strike a great blow at them. For sixty years the Institute had had the right to regulate its public meetings, to distribute the places, to appoint its functionaries, librarians, secretaries. What was equally important, its members were the sole judges in the competitions for the various prizes given either by the different or by the united academies. The Government diminished this precious prerogative. As for what concerned the Academy of Fine Arts, it assumed the right to choose the judges among the various members of the Academy. A long struggle ensued. After five years of discussion and of protestation, the effects of the imperial decree were practically annulled. The Emperor, in order to soothe the wounded feelings of the Institute, created a prize of 20,000 francs, which was to be given every two years by the five classes judging in common, "to the work, or to the discovery, which was judged the most likely to honor or to serve the country." This is called the biennial prize.

Ingres, Paul Delaroche, Horace Vernet, Paul Delacroix were the most famous members of the Academy. The three last died in rapid succession, Delaroche on the 4th of November, 1856. For twenty-four years he had exercised a great influence in the Academy; his salon as well as his atelier had become a centre of attraction. Horace Vernet was not so influential in the Academy; he was more personal, more susceptible; he died in 1863. Eugène Delacroix died six months afterwards. No painter has been more discussed; he has even now ardent friends and ardent enemies. He was a great colorist, but his drawing was imperfect, or rather seems imperfect, because he liked contorted and extraordinary attitudes. Ingres, who has been as much discussed as Delacroix, died in 1867, at the age of eighty-six.

It is certainly to the credit of the Duke of Orleans, the eldest son of Louis Philippe, who met such an untimely end by jumping out of his carriage, that he used to visit the painters in their studios and give them orders himself. He ordered the "Stratonice" of Ingres, and the "Assassination of the Duc de Guise" of Delaroche. These two famous pictures are of the same size; they are not large, and were ordered by the Duke for his own rooms. They are now in the galleries of the Duc d'Aumale at Chantilly. I have heard that one day Decamps, who was at the time quite unknown, saw the Duke of Orleans enter his studio with a long loaf of bread, such as is made by Paris bakers, under his arm. "How is this, your Royal Highness?" "Well, your porter asked me if I would not take this bread to you, as he could not just now mount your stairs." Decamps was chosen by the Duke of Orleans, with Raffet and some others, for the illustration of a magnificent work on his campaigns against the Kabyles.

The siege of Paris and the Commune were great trials for the Academy of Fine Arts; many of its members saw their work destroyed by fire: MM. Lesueur and Baltard, who had constructed or completed the Hôtel de Ville; Lehmann, Léon Cogniet, Cabanel, who had adorned its rooms and galleries with their pictures, beside the famous ceilings of Ingres and Delacroix; M. Duc, the architect of the new Palais de Justice, which was almost entirely ruined in its interior parts; M. Lefuel, who saw the library of the Louvre consumed by the flames, with the fine walls which he had decorated, as well as the magnificent apartments which he had arranged in the Tuileries. One house was entirely burned by the Communists in the Rue de Lille, opposite the Cour des Comptes, which now stands as the only ruin and witness of the Commune. It had been the house of the two Mariettes, and had become the home of a member of the Academy, M. Gatteaux, who had made it one of the objects of his life to collect all the studies and drawings of Ingres; he had collected also pictures by Sebastiano del Piombo, by Poussin, etc.; fine bronzes, enamels, drawings of the old masters, engravings. M. Gatteaux intended to leave all his collections to the National Library. Nearly all was burned. A picture by Memling, now in the Louvre, the "Mystic Marriage of Saint Catherine," was saved because it happened to be at the time in the house of an engraver. M. Gatteaux bore with great fortitude the loss of his magnificent collection, the finest in Paris at the time, and died in 1881, at the age of ninety-three years.

Auber, likewise, the musician, also an Academician, died at a very advanced age. He was of a very gay disposition. He once told a friend who complained of getting old, and pitied him, too: "Well, I accommodate myself to old age because it is the only way thus far discovered of living long." Still, when he reached his eighty-ninth year, he said: "There must be no exaggeration in anything; I have lived too long." He died on the 12th of May, 1871, during the Commune. The Communists wished to make a great ceremony of his funeral, as he was an extremely popular composer. To save him from this civic funeral, Ambroise Thomas, his friend, had to conceal his body secretly in the vaults of the Madeleine.

Under the reign of Napoleon I., as well as under the following reigns, the day of the public annual session of the five academies was the fête-day of the sovereign. In 1871, it was decided, as the Government had become republican, that this session should be held on the anniversary of the foundation of the Institute. The ceremony took place for the first time on the 25th of October, 1871. There were present M. Thiers, who was then President, and four of the Ministers of the Republic, MM. Dufaure, de Rémusat, Jules Favre, and Jules Simon, all Academicians. Since 1870, the Academy is again in full possession of its old prerogatives; it simply chooses freely artists who are still outside of the company, as supplementary judges for the distribution of its prizes; but it is sovereign in the choice of its laureates and of the young artists who are sent to the School of Rome. The patronage of the Academy extends every year. Baron Taylor has given to it a fund for pensions which are to be bestowed on old artists; this fund has been increased by the Brothers Galignani, who started long ago the only English paper which has for a long time been published in Paris. The Comtesse de Caen left a sum of money the interest of which has to be distributed yearly to the young pensioners of the School of Rome who come back to Paris and are still unknown. Mme. de Caen remembered that some of the best pupils of the School of Rome had at first had very hard times in Paris, especially the sculptors. A very touching legacy made to the Academy is the legacy of Dubosc, an ancient model. "Having," said he in his will, "begun to be a model in 1804, at the age of seven years, and having continued to be one till I was sixty-two years old, I have spent my life among artists, and I wish that after my death my small fortune should be employed in some foundation which will be useful to them."

It would be too long to give the whole list of the benefactors of the Academy and of the Institute. Last, but not least, comes the Duc d'Aumale, who has given to the five classes of the Institute the vast domain of Chantilly, with its forest, château, and the magnificent collections which it contains.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence.

MR. KENNAN AND SIBERIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a review of my book, 'Siberia and the Exile System,' published in the *Nation* of January 14, your reviewer says:

"The first thing which strikes the ordinary reader is the delightful and graphic style in which the book is written. Nothing could be better. It takes somewhat deeper knowledge and observation to appreciate another quality, viz., the art with which the omission of what is not desired is concealed. It is the commonest of practices to state only one side of a question, but the knack of doing so in a manner which shall leave the reader utterly unconscious that another side exists is a rare gift."

Will you kindly permit me to call the attention of the reviewer to a few pages of my work that he seems to have overlooked? The side of the Siberian question that I am accused of having artfully concealed is, of course, the good or favorable side. I am charged with an "intention to see everything in the blackest possible light," and to present everything in such a way as to "leave the reader utterly unconscious" that a lighter side exists. The word "everything" is somewhat vague and sweeping, but it is meant to include, I presume, Siberian prisons, Siberian officials, the Siberian exile system, and the treatment of criminals in the Siberian penal settlements. Your reviewer half asserts and half insinuates that I have said everything of an unfavorable nature that I could possibly find to say about these subjects, and that I have artfully concealed everything that would have a tendency to lighten or relieve the dark picture of Siberian penal life. Do the pages of my work furnish any justification for this sweeping and unqualified charge of premeditated dishonesty? I think not. The limited amount of space that can be given to such a communication as this will not permit me, of course, to quote here all that I have said, in two bulky volumes, in praise of Siberian prisons and Siberian officials; but three or four citations will be enough, I trust, to show that I have presented the favorable side of Russian penal institutions whenever there was a favorable side to present, and that if any one is to be charged with "clever lightness" and artful concealment, it is the reviewer.

In vol. i., pp. 299–301, of 'Siberia and the Exile System,' in speaking of the life of exiles on the convict barges between Tiumen and Tomsk, I state the fact that, for fifteen years, there has been a steady improvement in the hygienic condition of these barges and a corresponding decrease in the sick and death-rates, and then add that—

"In my judgment the inspector of exile transportation and the local Siberian authorities are now doing all that lies in their power to do for the comfort and health of exiles on the voyage between Tiumen and Tomsk. The barges are thoroughly cleaned and fumigated after every trip, and the prisoners are as well fed and cared for as they can be with the limited sum of money that the Government appropriates for the purpose. The suffering and disease which still exist are attributable, mainly, to overcrowding; and overcrowding the Siberian officials cannot prevent."

In vol. ii., pp. 125–127, I give a very favorable and commendatory description of the new convict prison at Verkhni Udinsk, in the province of the Trans-Baikal, in the course of which I say that—

"The *kámeras* [cells] were all large, well lighted and well ventilated, and every one of them, above the basement, had an extensive outlook over the surrounding country through at least three large windows. The corridors were twelve or fifteen feet wide; the stairways were of stone with iron balustrades; the solitary-confinement cells were as spacious as an ordinary American hall bed-room; the arrangements for heating, ventilation, and cleanliness seemed to me to be as nearly perfect as they could be made; and, as a whole, the prison impressed me as being the very best I had seen in Russia, and one of the best I had ever seen in any country."

In vol. ii., pp. 346–350, I give a long and favorable description of the Alexandrófski convict prison, near Irkútsk, in the course of which I say:

"We were taken first to the mills where 75 or 100 convicts were grinding rye. The air here was fresh and good; the labor, although hard, was not excessive, and the men who turned the cranks of the clumsy machines were relieved by others as fast as they became tired. This was the only hard labor that the inmates of the prison were required to perform, and it occupied only three or four hours a day. From the mills we went to the *kámeras*, which filled the greater part of the large building and which were occupied by from 15 to 75 men each. They varied greatly in size and form, but all were large enough for the number of convicts that they contained, the ceilings in them were high, the air everywhere was good, the floors and sleeping-benches were scrupulously clean, and nothing seemed to call for unfavorable criticism except, perhaps, the lack of bedding. The corridors into which the *kámeras* opened were high, spacious, and fairly well lighted, and the air in them seemed to be almost as pure as that out of doors. From the *kámeras* we went to the kitchens, where food was prepared every day for more than a thousand men, and where I could discover nothing that was out of harmony with the neatness and good order that prevailed in other parts of the building. . . . After paying a visit to the hospital, which contained only forty-two patients, and which was clean, well ventilated and in perfect order, we expressed ourselves as satisfied with our inspection of the prison and returned to Mr. Sipiagin's house. . . . Taken altogether, the Alexandrófski prison seemed to me to be in the highest degree creditable to its warden, and not discreditable to the Russian prison administration. It gives me great pleasure to say this, because I did not find much to approve in Siberian prisons generally, and I am glad to have an opportunity to praise where praise is deserved."

In vol. ii., pp. 366–368, I give a favorable description of the prisons in Krasnoyarsk, in the course of which I say:

"We made a careful examination, on Wednesday, of the Krasnoyarsk city prison, the exile forwarding prison, and the prison hospital, and I am glad to be able to say a good word for all of them. . . . At the time when we inspected them they were in better condition than any prisons that we had seen in Siberia, except the military prison at Ust Kamenogórsk and the Alexandrófski central prison near Irkútsk. The hospital connected with the Krasnoyarsk prisons seemed to me to be worthy of almost unqualified praise. It was scrupulously clean, perfectly ventilated, well supplied, apparently, with bed-linen, medicines, and surgical appliances, and in irreproachable sanitary condition generally. . . . At the time when we saw it I should have been willing, if necessary, to go into it for treatment myself."

In view of the above citations, I beg leave to ask your accomplished critic where he finds his warrant for the insinuation that I have tried to "see everything in the blackest possible light," and that I have artfully concealed from my readers even the fact that there is a brighter side to Siberian prison life? At whose door should the charge of artful concealment justly lie—at the door of the author who praises Russian penal institutions whenever he can do so truthfully, or at the door of the reviewer who, with "clever lightness," skips over all the praise, intimates coolly and confidently that there is none, and then proceeds, upon a false assumption, to charge the author with conscious and premeditated dishonesty? If the quotations that I have made from my book do not indicate a disposition on my part to see and present the light as well as the dark side of Siberian prison life, what do they indicate?

It is true that I have given more space in my book to bad prisons than to good ones; but, inasmuch as the bad outnumbered the good in the proportion of about ten to one, I could not well do otherwise. It is not true, however, that I have intentionally or consciously suppressed or concealed a single fact, within my knowledge, that would lighten the picture of Siberian penal life. I have always spoken well of Russian prisons, officials, and penal methods, when I could do so honestly. In vol. i., p. 270, I referred with approbation to a reform which had then recently been made in the method of forwarding criminals eastward from Tomsk—a reform which consisted in the separation of the sexes in convict marching parties; in vol. ii., p. 127, I spoke favorably of the new *étapes* erected by the Government at a cost of $200,000, in the province of the Trans-Baikal; in vol. ii., appendix F, I gave a tabular statement of the improvements and ameliorations in the condition of Siberian prisons and prisoners that had been made since my return from Siberia so far as they appeared in the reports of the Russian prison administration; in vol. ii., pp. 469–470, I gave an outline of the series of reforms in the exile system that had been projected by the Government and were under consideration when I left the empire; and, finally, I spoke favorably—sometimes very favorably—of Siberian officials in vol. i., pp. 168, 288, 300, 307, 308, 319, 345–346, and in vol. ii., pp. 42, 216–222, 290–291, 350, 368, 370, 371, and 467.

From the fact that your reviewer quotes a comment made upon my book by some unnamed person in Siberia, I infer that he has a Siberian correspondent. I respectfully and courteously challenge the reviewer or the correspondent to produce from ten years' files of any Siberian newspaper as many favorable descriptions of Siberian prisons and as many favorable references to Siberian officials as may be found in the two volumes of my book. Your reviewer admits, in his second article (published in the *Nation* of January 21), that I have spoken well, on the whole, of Siberian officials, and even says: "If there is one thing that Mr. Kennan has succeeded in demonstrating more plainly than the general high average of Russian character in the officers, . . . it is not only that the Russian Government is fully aware of the evil state of the Siberian prisons and *étapes*, but that it has appropriated funds and given orders for the construction of new and suitable buildings."

Will the reviewer be kind enough to explain how I have managed to demonstrate so clearly and conclusively that Russian officials are men of high character and that the Russian Government has done so much to remedy prison evils, while, at the same time, I have seen everything "in the blackest possible light," and have artfully concealed the fact that anything in favor of such officials and Government can possibly be said? I seem to have shown the high character and mild rule of the officials by seeing them in the "blackest possible light," and to have artfully concealed the Government's side of the prison question by giving it frank statement and conclusive demonstration! The only explanation of this paradox that suggests itself to me is the wild and improbable conjecture that the reviewer had forgotten what he said in his first article before he began to write the second.

GEORGE KENNAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 31, 1892.

[If Mr. Kennan will refer to our criti-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cism, he will see that the expression "clever lightness," to which he objects, was applied directly to the nature of his reading previous to 1884; to the information obtained in his preliminary journey of that year; and, indissolubly connected with this, to the question of intention, and his omission to explain the normal conditions of life among all but an exceedingly minute proportion of the exiles. This materially affects the question of the degree of cruelty to which the exiles are subjected and the criminal responsibility of the Government.

Far from skipping over his praises of officials and institutions, we reminded our readers that Mr. Kennan had proved the high character of the majority of the officials, and not only the good intentions, but the good performance of the Government in the matter of prisons and *étapes*. We are under obligations to Mr. Kennan for his detailed index of such cases (omitted in our criticism for lack of space). They will go far toward revising the false opinion of the general public, which has certainly regarded his revelations, and the Russian Government, in the blackest possible light, owing to the omission of precisely those details concerning the exile's normal life which we have supplied. It is an undeniable fact that not one in a thousand of Mr. Kennan's readers even notices his mention of those extenuating circumstances to which he now aids us in calling attention, owing to the unrelieved blackness of the descriptions to which we objected. Russians, on reading accounts worded in much the same way, would be able to make the proper allowances, through their lifelong acquaintance with the lives of the people, and of all classes. The omission of information on such a point, when writing for foreigners, lays an author open to the suspicion of intention or ignorance; the one being as grave an offence as the other in a work which assumes to be authoritative, on so serious a subject.

It would be a work of supererogation for us to furnish records, either favorable or unfavorable, from Siberian newspapers, after Mr. Kennan's ample contributions from those sources. His reference to the ten-year limit merely corroborates our suggestion that the darker side of the question was attainable in print for a long time previous to his journey in 1885, and brings us back to the assumption from which we started: that that journey was based on the sound calculations of a man who knew pretty well what he was going to "discover," and how his public would receive it.—Ed. Nation.]

BRITISH vs. RUSSIAN IMPRISONMENT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Perhaps in no circle of educated and thoughtful men is the meaning of the words "penal servitude" more clearly and really understood than among Irish Nationalists of advanced age. Many have themselves endured it; few there are who, at one period or another, often for long years, have not had friends or those they sympathized with or respected living through its horrors. I perused Mr. Kennan's *Century* articles, as they appeared, month after month, and constantly asked myself whether, after all, it might not be easier to bear in association with others the horrors he described than have to endure the cold, clean, merciless British system, where the body is conserved and cared for, but where the mind and affections of men who have theretofore thought and loved, are subjected to a discipline worse than death. And I asked the opinion of several who had passed through it. The republication of Mr. Kennan's articles in book form renewedly forces one's attention to the question. The readers of the *Nation* may perhaps be interested to consider the views of men so well known as the late Boyle O'Reilly and of Michael Davitt.

Very sincerely yours, Alfred Webb.

Dublin, January 31, 1892.

The "Pilot" Editorial Rooms,
Boston, October 23, 1889.

Mr. Alfred Webb:

My Dear Sir: The question you ask me has often arisen in my own mind, when reading Mr. Kennan's articles on Siberian prisoners: "Is not their miserable condition, with their one advantage of kindly human association, to be preferred to that of the English prisoner, in his narrow iron cell, and his silent labor in the gang, under the watch of never-ceasing rigor and discipline?" From my own experience in English prisons, the Russian system, described by Kennan, is at once to be preferred. So far as it allows political prisoners to associate only with their own kind, it is incomparably better than the English system, the makers or masters of which seem to delight in compelling the shameful association of political convicts with the criminal class. But, the political question aside, so far as the Russian system allows prisoners to associate and converse, at labor, and during the confined hours, its humane forbearance, in my opinion, counterbalances all its evils, as compared with the British home convict prisons. Mental suffering is the worst suffering; and, where there is association, there are comfort and courage. The body suffers pain by labor and privation, but the suffering of the mind in privation, labor, disgrace, with silence and loneliness, is agony.

The British penal colony of western Australia was an illustration. I was a prisoner there for a year (after nearly two years' imprisonment in Ireland and England). The feeling of relief at the open-air, associated labor of western Australia, after the rigors of Pentonville, Chatham, Portland, and Dartmoor, was actual enjoyment. Australia, however, had one immense advantage over Siberia—the climate was always healthful and delightful. In my opinion, the worst feature of Siberian imprisonment is the cold weather. The dirty prisons are kept foul by the necessity to keep them warm. In western Australia the convicts on the road parties had certainly no more care from their Government than those of Siberia; but they slept in open log huts, which they could and did empty and clean every day.

My memory of the dreadful routine of hard labor and enforced silence, in the imperial prisons, in England and Ireland, makes me shudder, even after twenty years. It is a punishment unfit for men, and it must be still worse for women, whose emotions are warmer and quicker. It is regulated inhumanity. It destroys many; it improves none. The moral reformation of a criminal under such conditions is abnormal and insecure. The flimsy barriers will be blown away with the first wind of free temptation. On the contrary, the effect of associated labor and life in the Australian colony was decidedly beneficial. It brought out the characteristics of manliness, truth, and personal honesty, in some such way as they are developed among soldiers. In one year I saw extraordinary improvement in a whole party of twenty criminal prisoners, to which I, though a political prisoner, was attached. They had all gone to Australia in the same ship with me and the other Fenian prisoners of 1866-'67. They were mostly old professional criminals, though nearly all young men. There were burglars, bank-robbers, thieves, in the majority. They were all Englishmen, most of them from London. As soon as ever they were sent away to the bush, to build their own hut and their officer's, and make out their own life, in the almost independence of the road-laborer, they began to develop as men—*for the first time in their lives*. Some became expert hunters and trappers, some took to tanning skins, some to vegetable gardening, etc. Very soon, they took personal pride in their free work, on the road or round the camp. They punished dishonesty and lying in their own way. If a man called another a liar, he had to fight him—he was *forced*, by flogging, to fight, or "take it back." Thieving from their fellows was punished in the same way. In three months there was no fighting and no flogging; in a year there were several men among them whom I shall always remember for their manly character. Every one of those men, probably, is free now, if living; and living an honest, industrious life.

A man released, after years of penal servitude, in Great Britain, is unfitted for life and its associations. He has been scared and drilled into habits of inhuman submission. Self-reliance is gone, for self-reliance is a sure relation to one's fellows, and this unfortunate man has had all his ties and tendrils clipped close as his hair. Penal servitude ought not to be the vengeance of a Government, as this is. Transportation to a colony where mutual freedom and citizenship can be insured will reform almost the entire criminal class that is not abnormally degraded. Between the objects of the Russian and English systems (now that Australian transportation has ceased) there is little to choose; but the associated exile of Siberia, with its horrors of cold and its foul prisons, is a far lighter and less injurious punishment than the relentless order, separation, half-starvation, and degraded servility of the convict prisons of Great Britain.

I am, dear Mr. Webb, most truly yours,
John Boyle O'Reilly.

Ballybrack, October 8, 1889.

My Dear Mr. Webb: I have read a good many of the American *Century Magazine*, with George Kennan's narratives of Siberian prisoners and exiles. I have also had the advantage of talks with my friend Stepniak, on the subject of Russia's treatment of political prisoners. But, I fear, my opinion would be more than sufficiently biassed already to preclude my giving what should be a strictly impartial judgment upon such a subject. No one who has undergone penal servitude can rid himself sufficiently of resentment against the power that imprisoned him to speak calmly and justly upon the topic of his treatment. Neither can absolute reliance be placed upon narratives such as Kennan's, in which all the powers of eloquent writing are employed for the purpose of rendering a manifest prejudice against the imprisonment of Nihilists in Siberia appear as if clothed in the language of unquestionable facts. Deducting these considerations from any opinion of mine, I would say:

(1.) That the solitary-cell system of English penal servitude, together with the forced association of the criminal element, as applied to political prisoners, would represent far keener mental suffering than I conceive to be involved in the confinement by congenial association, which appears to be the rule in many Siberian prisons, where attempts at escape, like that which Muishkin and his comrades made from Kara, do not involve separate-cell confinement and additional punishment.

(2.) The picture so powerfully drawn of the Tiumen Forwarding Prison exceeds anything in my experience of English convict life. The filth, the insanitary condition of the *kámeras*, their horrible crowding, etc., have no parallel in the worst of the nine prisons over which my experience extends. Cleanliness and arrangements for ventilation are very characteristic of Clerkenwell, Newgate, Portland, and Portsmouth Convict Prisons, though in Millbank and Dartmoor the sanitary conditions were not as good. The food appears to be much more liberal in Siberian prisons (according to what Kennan gives as the day's rations in Tiumen) than in England, but it is not as cleanly cooked.

(3.) To be followed into imprisonment by those one loves—by wife and children—would be, from the point of view of my own individual feeling, a horror for which I could not find a suitable name—that is, of course, if it were added to the existing penal servitude of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England. The bare idea of one's wife and children being associated with criminals, because a man is himself a prisoner, is too horrible a thing to contemplate. But, if such association (I mean that of wife and children) is considered along with political punishment which takes the form of exile into parts of Siberia where there is no actual confinement within prison walls, I would say that this would be infinitely preferable to the treatment included in the English penal system.

(4.) I do not think we can accurately, or even approximately, estimate the amount of suffering involved in the worst prison described by Kennan, from *our* point of view. What would be exquisite torture for a man of one kind of civilization, brought up under totally different habits and influences to those of Russian life, might not represent as much suffering to a Siberian prisoner. Then again, temperament, education, habits of life, all enter into the question of relative suffering in prison. For instance: if *I* had been allowed books, and the privilege of writing, during my seven years in Dartmoor, as I was while in Portland in 1881–'82, I would have felt comparatively happy, notwithstanding the convict dress and the solitary confinement. On the other hand, a temperament that could not find Wordsworth's world in "books and dreams," would suffer the greatest mental torture by being shut up, for days and months and years, between bare whitewashed walls. In order, therefore, to speak correctly of the punishment involved in a sentence of ten years, or of life, in a Siberian prison, I would have to know a great deal more about the previous life and individualities of the Nihilist prisoners than I have present knowledge of. I do not think the treatment of Siberian prisoners, outside of labor in the mines, to be as humiliating to a political prisoner, or as degrading to one's idea of manhood, as what is comprised in English penal servitude. You are compelled to act as if you were a thing devoid of soul, or sentiment, or individuality of any kind. You are simply reduced to the level of an animal, while all the higher attributes of your nature are deprived of all opportunity of ministering to your own or your neighbor's solace or mind's ease.—Yours very truly,

MICHAEL DAVITT.

SCIENCE IN AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the able review of 'The Comtist Calendar' in the *Nation* of January 21 occurs the following:

"There is no civilized country where a great work of reasoning is less feasible than in ours. We have the most superb observatories and laboratories, it is true, but what would a Kepler, with his bad sight and awkward hand, be doing in such an establishment? Perhaps among our sixty millions there may just now live one such mind; certainly nobody is on the lookout for him. If he does exist, what is he doing? Reading examination papers?"

No, indeed, it seems quite unlikely that this should be his occupation. If it were, we should soon hear of him. He would find time enough to work out some great thing that we should be able to admire, and soon he would rise to positions of high honor and comparatively high pay. He is much more likely, as a true son of his time and his country, to be wasting his time in making money. In this pursuit, no doubt, he is successful, his great talent having taken that direction. In Germany it is the army that absorbs the best talent of the country, and with us it is the chase after riches that causes many a brilliant talent to be lost to the world.

The trouble is that our colleges do not, in general, attract great talents. But it is not the universal craving for wealth alone that produces this result. Much of the blame no doubt falls to other causes, and these I prefer to state in the words of the Rev. James T. Bixby (*Unitarian Review*, August, 1888):

"On the other hand, the man among us who, outside the college circle, does original and able work, may hope in vain for a college appointment. He is not in the line of promotion, and the solid phalanxes are unwilling to admit a new-comer to interfere with the rules of seniority. And even if he has gained admission to the charmed circles, he must square his instruction with the demands of his superiors, or he is likely to be unceremoniously shown the door, as Prof. Felix Adler (by current rumor) was at Cornell University after his lectures on Buddhism, or as Prof. Alex. Winchell was at Vanderbilt University because of his belief in Pre-Adamites and Evolution."

To return to our Comtist Calendar review. Fermat and Jacob Steiner are mentioned among those who are barely assigned a place by Comte in his Calendar of great men, though Comte was himself a mathematician. Now, I would ask, how many are there, even among the readers of the *Nation*, who know anything about Jacob Steiner, or what he did? And this leads me to the subject I wish to urge, namely, that it seems high time we should begin the study of modern geometry. So far as I am aware, not a single book upon the subject has been published in America, nor is the study of modern geometry pursued in any of our institutions by purely geometric methods. Yet modern geometry is by far more interesting, more systematic, more fruitful of results than the Euclidian geometry. Steiner, in the preface to his 'Systematische Entwickelung,' says: "There exists a small number of simple fundamental relations, from which the remaining great number of theorems can be derived, and without difficulty. Thus, by the acquisition of the few fundamental relations, one becomes master of the whole subject." And in the book itself, with wonderful ease, he derives almost everything from *one* fundamental relation, namely, the anharmonic ratio. The principle of duality there shows itself in its wonderful fecundity. Any one who will take the trouble of studying Chauvenet's "Introduction to Modern Geometry," appended to his 'Elements,' will understand the possibilities of the method, and, furthermore, will be prepared for the study of the larger works, say, Chasles's. It would be easy to compile a good text-book from easily accessible sources. Thus, the 'Traité de Géométrie,' by Rouché and De Comberousse, alone, in its various appendices, contains all or nearly all the material necessary, and collections of problems exist in goodly number.

Permit me to plead for one more neglected mathematical study, namely, the functions of complex variables (functions of $x + \sqrt{-1}\, y$). When we find that the realm of number is not of one dimension, so as to be representable upon a single infinite straight line, but that it has *two* dimensions, and requires a whole infinite plane to represent it, our horizon is at once infinitely widened. When next we find that by taking $z=f(x + i\, y)$ as the general form of the equation of a plane curve, and that we encounter no longer the puzzling difficulty of having the dependent variable become "imaginary" and meaningless, while undoubtedly it continues to vary, we see the usefulness of the method. And, finally, when we follow Rieman to his *mehrfach zusammenhängende Flächen*, we cannot help admiring the beauty of this modern analysis.

Shall we continue to plead that this is a new country, and that as yet we have no time for the sciences, except so far as they serve some technical purpose in the useful arts? The Australians seem to disdain such a plea, and we hear of vigorous scientific work done at Melbourne.—Respectfully,

WERNER A. STILLE.

ST. LOUIS, January 25, 1892.

[These things are worth saying; albeit the first question, upon which our correspondent so lightly expresses himself, involves points of high debate among those who of late years have studied the problem of genius. We shall return to some of these in a notice of Lombroso's 'Man of Genius.' Meantime, we remark that Kepler, with all his advantages, did but one great work, and that that was by no means the sort of thing a college tutor "would find time enough" to toss off.

As to the teaching of the two important branches of mathematics to which Mr. Stille refers, we derive the following information, relating chiefly to the year 1888–9, from Prof. Cajori's document on the 'Teaching of Mathematics in the United States.' The Theory of Functions was the subject, at the Johns Hopkins University, of several courses; at Cornell of a two-years' elective course, with sessions thrice a week one year, twice a week another; at Harvard of an advanced course; at Princeton of a University course; at Madison of a "special advanced elective" (possibly not taken). Projective (modern synthetic) Geometry was the subject of a course at the Johns Hopkins; at Cornell was *required* for some students, elective for others; at Ann Arbor was studied (and *really* studied, as we happen to know) from Reye's admirable treatise; and at the Universities of Texas (where Cremona's charming book was used), Virginia, and South Carolina formed the subject of post-graduate lectures or examinations. This, though a poor showing, yet makes a beginning.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

TRANSLATIONS of Paul Bourget's 'Impressions of Italy,' of Pierre Loti's 'Book of Pity and of Death,' of Gabriel Bonvalot's 'Across Thibet,' and of E. Renan's 'Recollections, Letters, and Addresses,' are in the press of Cassell & Co. The last is from the practised hand of Miss Hapgood.

Charles Scribner's Sons will continue their reproduction of the historical series of Imbert de Saint-Amand by publishing his 'Youth of the Duchess of Angoulême.'

Macmillan & Co., reversing the usual order, and having begun with a condensed popular edition, in one volume, of Mrs. Humphry Ward's new novel, 'The History of David Grieve,' are now about to issue a two-volume edition in larger type.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have in press a "Universal Edition" of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' to be sold at 25 cents in paper and 50 cents in cloth; 'Songs of Fair Weather,' by Maurice Thompson; 'Equatorial America,' by M. M. Ballou; and lives of William Gilmore Simms, by Prof. W. P. Trent, and of Mark Hopkins, by his successor, President Carter of Williams.

Henry Holt & Co. will add immediately to Sneath's "Series of Modern Philosophers" volumes extracted from Reid by Dr. Sneath of Yale University; from Spinoza by Prof. Fullerton of the University of Pennsylvania; from Kant by Prof. Watson of Queen's College, Canada; and from Descartes, by Prof. Torrey of the University of Vermont. They contemplate adding in the near future volumes from Berkeley, Hume, and Hegel.

A. C. Armstrong & Son will publish shortly 'From the Usher's Desk to the Tabernacle

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pulpit,' an authorized Life of the late Mr. Spurgeon. It will contain numerous portraits, with other illustrations.

Thomas Whittaker announces a volume of lectures (in the Charlotte Wood Slocum foundation at Ann Arbor), 'The Chalcedonian Decree: or, Historical Christianity, Misrepresented by Modern Theology, Confirmed by Modern Science, and Untouched by Modern Criticism,' by John Fulton, D.D.; and two volumes of sermons by the late Archbishop of York, Dr. Magee, 'Growth in Grace,' and 'Christ the Light of all Scripture.' Also, 'The Story of the Discovery of the New World by Columbus,' compiled by Frederick Saunders.

The Rev. S. J. Andrews's 'Life of Our Lord upon Earth' won high regard on its first publication, thirty years ago, by virtue of its minute treatment of the chronological and topographical questions involved in the subject, and it is these specialties, in the new and thoroughly revised edition just published by the Scribners, which will commend the work to scholars. Putting aside, as the author does, all questions of the authorship and formation of the gospels, it will be seen that he renounces entrance into the most instructive and fascinating field of New Testament criticism.

'The Races of the Old Testament,' by A. H. Sayce (F. H. Revell Co.), is a little study in ethnology based for the most part upon Mr. Petrie's valuable series of photographs of types found on the Egyptian monuments.

The full text of the Manderson Bill for the printing, binding, and distribution of public documents is given in the January issue of the *Library Journal*. The December number is wholly occupied with a report of the San Francisco Conference of the American Library Association. A reprint of the admirable paper on "Public Support of Public Libraries," read at this Conference by Mr. William E. Foster of the Providence Public Library, is before us. It is an effective reply to a shallow chapter in the recent work called 'A Plea for Liberty: An Argument against Socialism and Socialistic Legislation.'

The second report of the Massachusetts Free Public Library Commission is very encouraging. Thirty-six towns during the past year have established libraries and received from the State $100 worth of books, leaving only sixty-six towns (with an aggregate population of 92,439) unprovided with free libraries. The books given have been selected with great care and with especial reference to the character and needs of the community in which they are to be placed, the main object having been to provide "reading that should be healthy in tone, pure and attractive in style, of educational value, and fitted to stimulate a love for the reading of good literature. American history, local and general, and nature-study in its varied forms, have had particular prominence given them." Not the least interesting part of the report is the "notes of library progress," containing statements of the numerous gifts in money, books, and buildings made to the various towns in the State during 1891, as well as of the buildings begun or completed last year. A detailed account of each newly established library, with various laws relating to libraries, is given in an appendix.

The Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence published on the last day of November, 1891, a valuable list of non-political Italian periodicals received at that library during the past year. The arrangement is in classes, with an alphabetical index of titles, another of places of publication, and a third of editors (*scrittori*). The task has been admirably executed by Paolo Baccani and Miss Anita Castellano. One desires only a table of classification. There are four entries under the head of "Magnetismo e Spiritismo," beginning with the monthly *Annali dello Spiritismo in Italia*. The number of journals devoted to "Wants" is noticeably large. A typical example is the *Gazzetta degli impieghi vacanti governativi, municipali, commerciali e privati*. The total of all kinds is 1,362.

A discovery of considerable importance has been recently made by Mr. Kordt, an assistant in the library of the University of Dorpat in Livonia. While rummaging in a large wall-closet, full of what were supposed to be worthless records and duplicates, he found several rolls of manuscript, which proved to be the remains of the archives of the University, the minutes of the proceedings of the Senate of Dorpat, and the account-books of the University, which furnish valuable material for the history of the founding of that institution by Gustavus Adolphus in 1632 and its early development under Swedish jurisdiction. The documents thus brought to light number some six hundred, and are written in Latin, Swedish, German, French, and Russian. They comprise the correspondence of the Swedish Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna, his son John Oxenstierna, Envoy Plenipotentiary to Germany, the Generals de la Gardie, Horn, Banèr, Wrangel, and about sixty letters, instructions, and other communications from the hand of Gustavus Adolphus, dating chiefly from the years 1613, 1627, and 1629. The importance of these original sources for the history of the Thirty Years' War, the various negotiations with Russia and other Powers, and the final conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, can hardly be overestimated. Mr. Kordt is preparing them for publication, and hopes to render them available to scholars at an early date.

The second number of the *Law Bulletin* of the State University of Iowa contains an historical bibliography of the Statute Law of Iowa by T. L. Cole of Washington. Incidentally the steps towards acquiring Statehood are set forth, from which it appears that six years were spent in the effort, the popular reluctance being as great as the popular celerity nowadays; but "Iowa, like so many other of the admitted States, set the machinery of her State Government into full operation before the date of formal admission."

The London *Bookman* (Hodder & Stoughton) maintains well the level on which it was launched. Its January issue "presents" an inserted plate engraving from a portrait of Browning in the Count D'Orsay style and period, and reproduces in facsimile on its foolscap pages a creditable letter of Robert Burns touching provision for an illegitimate child. The *Publishers' Circular*, on its part, began on January 16 an illustrated series of articles on wood-engraving—forerunners, we may assume, of still another book on that fruitful topic.

In the February number of the new *California Illustrated Magazine*, Lieut. George L. Dyer, U. S. N., has a very good account of the military operations marking the final success of the Chilian revolutionists. He is naturally reticent in regard to the suspicions thrown upon his superior officer, Admiral Brown, though he makes it perfectly clear that that commander was in a position to render the greatest possible services to Balmaceda, by way of informing him of the resources and plans of the Congressionalists, had he been disposed to do so.

Mrs. Bishop's anniversary address before the Royal Scottish Geographical Society, published in its magazine for January, summarizes the results of her adventurous journey among the Bakhtiari, a Persian mountain tribe of nomads. One of the most striking passages is that in which she describes their summer country, in whose villages the traveller in May finds an absolute solitude, though the hill-slopes are covered with grain-crops and intersected with irrigation ditches. But by the first of June "every plateau and ravine has its village of tents, and at night the camp-fires gleam like the lights of cities." Here the tribe dwell till October, then migrate to the plains, sowing the grain before they depart, and reaping it in the following summer. Mrs. Bishop has little to say that is encouraging for the future of this interesting people, whose characteristic virtues are bravery, chastity, and charity; their blood-feuds leading to constant intertribal wars and checking all progress. To this may be added the merciless exactions of the Persian officials, who are slowly crushing the life out of the people. Incidentally she refers to the great commercial activity of the Russians in Persia, their wares being found in almost every hamlet or camp visited in a journey of about 2,000 miles, however remote they were from the great caravan routes. Mr. E. Delmar Morgan sketches the Pamir in its geographical and political relations to the surrounding countries, his paper being accompanied by an admirable map, in which the Russian boundary under the agreement of 1873 is given, together with that now claimed. This is placed more than a hundred miles to the southward, absorbing the territory left neutral by the agreement, and coming within about seventy miles of the English at Gilghit.

Recent events in the Pamir give a peculiar interest to Mr. St. George Littledale's account of his journey across this desolate region, published in the January Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society. The traveller, whose main object was to shoot the great horned sheep, the *Ovis Poli*, was accompanied by his wife, their point of departure being Osh, then the farthermost Russian post in Ferghana. From this place, where they were treated with the greatest courtesy by the Russian commandant, they went in a generally southerly direction, skirting the eastern shore of the Karakul and traversing both the Alichur and the Great and Little Pamirs, reaching Gilghit in a little more than two months after leaving Osh. The general elevation was rarely less than 12,000 feet, the highest point reached being apparently 15,950 feet on the pass of Darkot over the Hindu Kush. Mr. Littledale describes the region as in great part a barren wilderness, with few inhabitants, scant vegetation, and little animal life, though birds are very numerous on the lakes. Had he passed a month later, his account of its capacity for supporting life would probably have been more favorable. The latest Russian authority, Col. Grombchevsky, says that "the Pamir is far from being a wilderness. It contains a permanent population, residing in it both summer and winter," and "increasing to a marked extent."

Prof. James Darmesteter has some fine pages in the *Revue Bleue* of January 9. "Les Religions de l'Avenir" is the title of his article, which is, in fact, the preface of his new book, 'Les Prophètes d'Israël,' which was announced to be published by Calman Lévy on the 20th ultimo. The fundamental idea of the book is that "prophétisme"—that is, the *ensemble* of the doctrines proclaimed by the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prophets of Israel from the year 800 to the year 518 before our era, and expressed in the so-called prophetic books of the Old Testament—is one of the essential elements of the religion of the future. It will not set up new altars or new rites, since its aim is to lead men beyond altars and rites, but it will inspire and revive the "two actual religions which to-day dispute possession of France, and which to-morrow will share it in peace, that of Science and that of Christ." M. Darmesteter's article is quite in line with those of M. de Vogüé and others who have been writing on the new religious movement in France, and will be of great interest to all who have been following the development of that movement.

Cardinal Newman is to have a statue at Oxford. The list of subscribers to it shows a singularly wide range. It includes Anglicans and Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, peers and commoners, university heads and ecclesiastical dignitaries of every shade of thought, politicians like Lord Rosebery and Mr. Justin M'Carthy, literary men like Mr. Lecky and Mr. F.T. Palgrave, and the late Dean Church.

Our readers will recall the mention in these columns last May of the generous offer by Miss Garrett of $100,000 to the trustees of Johns Hopkins University, on condition that by February 1, 1892, the trustees should have raised $221,000, and would in that month formally announce the opening in October, 1892, of the Medical School of the University. The admission of its women students to all the dignities and honors of the Medical School was a further condition of the offer. The sum needed to secure Miss Garrett's $100,000 was the amount still lacking towards the $500,000 named by the trustees as necessary to the opening of the Medical School when they accepted the contribution of $111,300 from the committees of the Women's Fund, on condition of receiving women students on the same terms as men. It has just been announced that the trustees have raised no part of this amount. Miss Garrett has therefore released the time limit to her donation, and gives the University an indefinite period to secure the endowment of its Medical Department, reserving the right, however, to cancel the offer of $100,000, by giving one year's notice of withdrawal. When the thousands of dollars which, during 1891, were contributed by numerous donors for the cause of higher education in the United States are considered, it is subject of surprise even more than of regret, that a university whose professors and alumni during the past decade have carried the reputation of American research and scholarship into every great seat of learning in both the Old and the New World, should still go begging for what is, after all, a paltry portion of a superb educational foundation.

—The February *Atlantic* lacks any article of special distinction, all the papers being of limited interest. The recent archæological discoveries at Rome, in respect to the celebration of the Secular Games in 17 B. C., are described by Prof. Lanciani with enthusiasm, and the fortunes of Gabriele Giolito, a Venetian publisher of the sixteenth century, are told by Mr. Horatio F. Brown in a similar vein of student ardor. The intelligence of animals is examined by Prof. Evans, with a view to the confusion of the late Prof. von Prantl, who denied them the "time-sense," besides other things, and the critic has made an entertaining collection of those peculiar institutions of beast, fowl, and insect which seem to parody the organs of human society. The course of study followed by French girls is treated of by Henrietta Channing Dana with thoroughness and good sense, in a way instructive to the managers of our female colleges, and also illustrative of the better and less-known phases of French family life. Some Russian travel, a bit of Shaksperian criticism, and a paper by Prof. Shaler describing the condition of political opinion in Kentucky in 1861, complete the list of serious articles, with a single exception, an unsigned paper upon "The League as a Political Instrument," which, in connection with the remarkable tariff-reform paper of last month, and other political papers that have appeared under Mr. Scudder's editorship, mark a return of the *Atlantic* to the useful discussion of public questions. The idea of this contribution—namely, that the development of the League puts into the hands of independent-thinking citizens an instrument of proved power in the form of temporary party organization for single definite ends, dissolving when those ends are gained—is not new, but the clearness with which the fact is stated and the practical force of it realized gives significance to the paper, and foreshadows an attempt, at least, to systematize independent voting and convert it from a defiant "rebuke" into an aggressive weapon. The success of the Copyright League, the Civil-Service League, and the Indian Service Association is the solid foundation of the writer's argument.

—*Harper's* is also without any article of special distinction, but it makes up for the lack by lending itself to a piece of as crude sensationalism as has appeared in magazine literature for many a day. This extraordinary contribution is nothing less than an entire five-act play by Amélie Rives Chanler on the subject of "Athelwold." The scene is laid in that distant age when "Angleland" existed, and we presume it is mere carping on our part to suggest that the historical setting is pretty closely confined to the orthography. The story is of love, and the action is for the most part osculatory. It is Catullus's little lyric drawn out in linked sweetness, kiss by kiss. The author seems to have remembered *Rosalind's* way when she was "gravelled for matter." There are eighty-two of these amatory exercises in a single act, without making distinction of plural and singular. There has been of late much discussion of wedding literature to the stage once more, but this is the way to throw contempt on "the literary drama." It is, however, little that this play cannot be thought of as acted. Not to put too fine a point on it, here is the very slush of vulgarity: in character, in incident, in diction, the underbred cannot farther go; it is the burlesque and travesty of the thing it aims at being, and what service is done, either to the public or to the name of American letters or the young woman herself, by its publication? In the remainder of the magazine Mr. Julian Ralph writes of Chicago in "the large style," though not perhaps as Matthew Arnold meant the phrase; the Royal Danish Theatre is the subject of a paper from Mr. Archer; Mr. Horatio Bridge's recollections of Hawthorne continue; and an article of local interest, on the "Old Shipping Merchants of New York," winds up the number.

—The *Century* justifies its reputation for public spirit this month by the merciless exposure it makes of the history and methods of the Louisiana lottery and the character of the men who have been engaged in the enterprise. The paper itself is a remarkable one in lively management of matter naturally dry, in variety of attack, in restless and unexpected sarcasm. The black story is told so that it makes its own darkness visible without aid of light from any moral world; the origin of the scheme, its breeding out of the racing and gambling industries of New York, its course in the State that it chose for degradation, its gradual fettering of the whole community there, the forlorn struggle against it, are recounted in a way to make the names of its owners (for the paper deals directly with persons) a synonym of infamy in public affairs; and the present gravity of the question is urged home without effort, but with telling effect. The Supreme Court reminds Mr. John A. Morris that he is a citizen, but such a paper as this also reminds him that he does really live in a community where public opinion is still capable of blasting the success of enormous wealth gathered in defiance of the common morals of the land. The fight may not be over, but the example of such a deadly stroke as this paper is a fine object-lesson to both sides; it shows resource and courage of the sort that makes a bad cause beware. Incidentally, also, the stripping off of the mask of charity is a blow to all schemes for condoning evil practices for a price devoted to good objects—and few errors in morals are so insidious as this one, or so widespread among honest people. To quicken conscience in such matters is a good work. Another paper of public importance in the number is Mr. Atkinson's on "The Registration of Australian Land Titles." The remaining papers are of the usual kind, and fairly distributed among the different departments of science, society, history, art, and fiction.

—*Scribner's* contains a philanthropic paper by Mr. Albert Shaw describing briefly the Young Women's Institute of London, which has been developed under the fostering care of Mrs. Quentin Hogg, and is meant to do for working girls at the West End the same service that her husband's "Polytechnic" does for young men. The club has had only a few years' trial, but its success is assured, and it already provides for a membership of twelve hundred. The plan is essentially the same as that of the older institution for young men, and includes the dining, athletic, and school features; there is some interchange between the two clubs in order that some of the special advantages of the men's side may be shared by the women; the final result, too, will probably be to settle the Institute on a permanent foundation endowed from the Public Charities Funds. The example is an interesting one, but it obviously owes much to favoring circumstances, to the experience and benevolence of Mr. Hogg and his wife, to their prestige, and to the fact that the Public Charities Fund is available for the perpetuation of the organization. A scientific article of considerable interest deals with the "Illusions of Memory," and, apart from the description and analysis of the tricks of this faculty, points out some analogies between its operations in unusual states and the workings of the mind under hypnotic influence. At the end the strength of the faculty is made to depend on sane and healthy conditions in general rather than on any special cultivation. The Revenue Service affords a readable article, and some remarks of Washington Allston on his methods of painting have as much interest as the subject permits.

—A measure of the quality of instruction and grade of students at the Harvard "Annex" is afforded by the "Fay House Monographs" published by the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women. Two of these have been anatomical studies; the third and latest is entitled 'Fugitive Slaves (1619–1865),' and has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been prepared by Miss Marion Gleason (Mrs. McDougall), under the direction of Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard. The monograph occupies 150 octavo pages, and is in every way a highly creditable as it is a very useful performance. The several chapters deal with "Legislation and Cases before the Constitution," "Legislation from 1789 to 1850," "Principal Cases from 1789 to 1860," "Fugitives and their Friends," "Personal Liberty Laws," "The End of the Fugitive Slave Question (1860-1865)." This systematic presentation is accompanied in five invaluable appendixes by the documents, viz., the colonial laws relating to fugitives, national acts and propositions relating to fugitive slaves (1778-1854), and again (1860-64), list of important fugitive slave cases, and bibliography of fugitive-slave cases and fugitive-slave legislation. Add a very full index. In the colonial portion Mrs. McDougall has had no predecessor; nor has any one relieved her of the drudgery of wading through the Congressional records, without which it would have been impossible to realize how constant were the efforts made to amend more stringently the law of 1793, since history preferably deals with *faits accomplis* and is silent about abortive measures, however significant of states and tendencies of opinion. This restless striving to stop the exodus from slavery to freedom is perhaps the most striking revelation in Mrs. McDougall's monograph; but it is also instructive to compare the text of the fugitive-slave act signed by Washington with that which brought infamy on Millard Fillmore, and to notice how little difference there was in respect to the treatment of slaves as mere chattels, and to the absence of provisions against the kidnapping of free men of color—or free Caucasians, for that matter. And if we consider how many doctors of divinity enforced, after Webster, the duty of returning Onesimus, we shall not conclude that a perceptible moral advance had been made in 1850 over the North Carolina stage of 1741, evidenced by a law requiring a description of apprehended unknown runaways to be "sent to the clerk or reader of each church or chapel within the county. They were required to post all such notices every Lord's day for two months in some convenient place near the church." Finally, it is wholesome for the Grand Old Party to be reminded that in 1864, amidst the civil war caused by slavery alone, Senator John Sherman proposed to abolish the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 only by an act reviving the law of 1793. Mrs. McDougall's survey is very comprehensive, and we have observed but one omission, viz.: an estimate of the number of past-fugitives compelled by the law of 1850 to abandon their homes and occupations and seek refuge in Canada. Statistics on this point are of course vague, but they are not wholly wanting. On page 26, the dates of British West India Emancipation should be 1833, 1838. The fugitive William Browne, on p. 5, is not indexed; his namesake, on p. 56, presumably stands for the late William Wells Brown.

—The volume of Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society for 1891 winds up the record of the Society's first century, and so is largely occupied with an account of the centennial celebration. It is illustrated with portraits of three eminent men, President Walker of Harvard, Richard H. Dana, and Robert Bennet Forbes, memoirs being furnished by O. B. Frothingham, Charles Francis Adams, and Leverett Saltonstall, respectively. There is also a very precious photograph, taken in 1858, of a remarkable group of members, of whom Mr. Robert C. Winthrop is the most distinguished survivor. Mr. Winthrop's son contributes the opening paper of the present collection, and it is easily first also in lightness of touch, and in the charm with which the writer invests genealogical and family particulars concerning persons of no great consequence, yet types of early Puritan society. Mr. Winthrop also prints a strong and characteristic letter of Thomas Hooker's, replete with worldly wisdom. The most serious and permanently valuable study is that of Mr. Charles Francis Adams on "Some Phases of Sexual Morality and Church Discipline in Colonial New England." The first part of his subject is not new to those who have been led, for other reasons, to examine church records, which abound in evidence of marriages to legitimize children; or to those who have ventured into the literature of bundling. Mr. Adams, however, gives precision and strength to his deductions by comparing the records of several localities in Massachusetts, and discovers "the compelling cause to the confessions [of the sin of fornication]" openly made in church to have been "the parents' desire to secure baptism for their offspring during a period when baptism was believed to be essential to salvation, with the Calvinistic hell as an alternative." In the Groton Church, under this compulsion, 66 out of 200 persons owning the baptismal covenant between 1761 and 1775 "confessed to fornication before marriage." "C. F." became the abbreviated record of this circumstance. Mr. Adams remarks upon the increase in the number of the confessions after 1725, which he connects with "The Great Awakening," or revival period, of 1726-1744, and its dangerous association of the sexes in a state of religious exaltation. Mr. Adams closes with some encouraging reflections as to the comparative morality of the last century and the present, without, however, attributing our gain in sexual morality to the rise in the status of woman, as would appear to be necessary.

CLARK'S COLLEGES OF OXFORD.—I.

The Colleges of Oxford: Their History and Traditions. Twenty-one chapters contributed by members of the colleges, edited by Andrew Clark, M.A., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. London: Methuen & Co.; New York: Macmillan.

THE Rev. Andrew Clark has hit upon the plan of having the history of each of the Oxford Colleges written by one of its own members, and in each case he has succeeded in getting a distinguished man to do the work. The papers, coming from different hands, are, as might have been expected, not uniform in mode of treatment. Some have more of anecdote and social antiquities, others more of architecture, others (the writer of which has, perhaps, been bursar) more of the history of college finance and landowning; but they supplement each other, and on the whole they give a satisfactory account of those foundations, and sufficiently enable us to follow the thread of their corporate life through the six centuries of English history. There will be room for revision in a second edition, but in the main the work has probably been done once for all.

The eldest of the foundations is University College, the name of which, by its identity with that of the body of which the colleges in the aggregate are a federation, perplexes the American visitor who has not been accustomed to distinguish exactly between a university and a college. The Master and Fellows some years ago had the courage—or, as Mr. Freeman, who has no mercy on myths, thought, the effrontery—to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of their college as a foundation of King Alfred. That the eldest of English literary institutions should dedicate itself to Alfred's memory would be proper enough; and it is likely enough that Oxford was the seat of one of Alfred's schools. But University College was founded in the thirteenth century by Master William of Durham, who had been an English student in the University of Paris and had been driven out by an academical revolution. The story of the foundation by Alfred is a fable or worse. It appears to have been fabricated by the college to induce Richard II. to exert his prerogative in its favor in a law suit. It sufficed, however, with the help, perhaps, of a touch of Hanoverian policy, to lead the Court of King's Bench in 1728 to decree that the College was a royal foundation, and that the Visitor was not the University, or the Faculty of Theology, but the Crown. It was argued on that occasion that it would be too shocking for the Court to hold that a society of clergymen had for so many years been returning thanks to God for the bounty of a mythical founder, and that religion would thereby receive a greater scandal than it had from all the atheists, deists, and apostates from Julian down to Collins. It is not easy for the University now to return, as the author of this essay wisely exhorts it, to the firm ground of historical truth. The myth is incorporated into its legal existence as well as blazoned in its escutcheon, and embodied in the fine bust of Alfred which looks down on the Fellows as they sip (or did before recent reforms) their wine around the ample fireplace in the cosey old Common Room.

The statue of James II., which was left intact over the college gate, attests the mildness of the Revolution of 1688. Obadiah Walker, who was Master at that time, was a learned man and about the most respectable of the apostates to Roman Catholicism, though his name, rhyming with *Ave Maria*, lent itself to popular mockery. In an ecclesiastical law suit the other day, where there was a question as to the mode of treating the remnants of the bread and wine after the administration of the Sacrament, Sir Horace Davey, an ex-Fellow of University, referred to the practice of his own college, where the Master and Fellows, when the service is over, instead of consuming the remainder of the elements at the communion table, march out to consume them in the ante-chapel. It did not occur to him that this practice, evidently a protest against the High-Church view, was a relic of the reaction which followed the expulsion of Walker and the Romanizing party. That reaction has left other traces in the College customs. The vicissitudes of history are marked by the combination of the statue of Eldon with that of James II., while the Common Room of the College was the scene of the expulsion of Shelley. For the expulsion of Shelley, we may remark in passing, the College was not much to be blamed. His circulation, among clerical dignitaries, of an atheistic treatise, was an outrage, even on the atheistic hypothesis, and his contumacy shut upon him the gate of mercy.

University and Balliol, though, as the oldest foundations, they head the list, were not the first colleges. The first real college, the type of the series and the model to which University and Balliol were afterwards assimilated, was Merton, founded by Walter de Merton in what has been called the Renaissance of the thirteenth century. Merton's idea was the combination of the cenobitic, cloistral, and disciplined

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life of a monastery with secular studies, which were practically anti-monastic. His antagonism to the domination of the friars, who were then carrying everything before them, is marked by the statute excluding them from his fellowships. His cloistral discipline was the antidote to the turbulence which reigned among a vast concourse of students, many of them half barbarous, living at large in the city, and which broke out in riots, and even in regular battles between the Northern and Southern "nations." The idea, meeting the needs of the time, took root and bore fruit in a series of imitations.

The grandest of the imitations was New College, or, to give it its proper name, the College of St. Mary Winton, founded by William of Wykeham, prelate, statesman, and architect, in the time of Edward III. St. Mary Winton College was to Merton as an abbey to a priory. The equipments for religious services were on an abbatial scale of magnificence, and the warden lived with the sumptuous state of a great abbot. But as a literary foundation New College was distinguished by its connection with the school at Winchester, which was to supply it with carefully trained scholars, and by the stress laid in the statutes on the study of the classical languages, or at least of Latin (*grammatica*), as contrasted with those of scholastic logic and philosophy. Mr. Rashdall, the writer of the paper in this volume on New College, rejects the notion that Wykeham himself had any idea connected with the Renaissance; but he afterwards admits that the first breath of the Renaissance air is felt in the characteristic studies of the foundation. It is hard to believe that a great patron of learning contemporary with Chaucer should have been untouched, or not consciously touched, by the spirit and movement of his age. Wykeham, it is true, was a conservative and an adversary of the Wicliffites; his object, no doubt, was to recruit the ranks of the clergy and put on them the armor of learning, though in a critical and revolutionary age the armor of learning can hardly be put on men without engendering other than conservative tendencies in their minds. The University was apparently at this time in a state of depression, and a collateral object of Wykeham's was the revival of literary discipline. Before him all the instruction had been received in the public schools of the University, the college being only the boarding-house, or at least having no regular staff of teachers. Wykeham introduced teaching within the college, and thus became, for good or evil, the founder of the tutorial system which ultimately superseded the teaching of the University, and reduced the University professorships to an insignificance from which they have been only just redeemed by recent reforms, while even now the tutorial system disputes their domain with them, as energetic professors, like Prof. Freeman, think they have reason to complain. A loose system of obtaining from the University exemptions from the statutable conditions of graduation had prevailed. To guard against this, Wykeham, as an academical reformer, strictly forbade his students to "sue for graces." By a strange and almost incredible perversion of his intention, this exceptional restriction was itself turned into an exceptional exemption, and when regular examinations for degrees were introduced by the University, it was understood that a New College man had the privilege of taking his degree without a University examination. The consequence was the almost total wreck, for a long period, of Wykeham's Oxford foundation. His school at Winchester, which retained its high character, sent up to Oxford generations of "golden scholars," only to have them turned by privileged idleness into "silver bachelors" and "leaden masters." A similar calamity befell the kindred foundation of King's College at Cambridge, with which Eton was connected as Winchester was connected with New College. Both cases are sad warnings against allowing the letter of a founder's will to operate long after his death. The principle upon which Parliament acted in the reform of the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges, and which it may be said practically to have adopted with regard to all foundations, is that only a founder's main object shall be respected for more than fifty years after the date of the foundation—a limit certainly beyond the foresight of any ordinary man.

Wykeham's statutes give us an insight into the life and character of students in those days:

"One piece of rough mediæval horse-play which incurs the founder's especial wrath is that 'most vile and horrid sport of shaving beards, which is wont to take place on the night preceding the inception of Masters of Arts.' Among the more ordinary pastimes forbidden by the founder are the haunting of taverns and 'spectacles,' the keeping of dogs, hawks, or ferrets; the games of chess, hazard, or ball; and other 'noxious, inordinate, or illicit' games, 'especially those played for money'; shooting with 'arrows, stones, earth, or other missiles' to the danger of windows and buildings; the 'effusion of wine, beer, or other liquor' (some unpleasant details are added under this head) upon the floor of upper chambers; 'dancing or wrestling or other incautious or inordinate games' in the hall or 'perchance in the chapel itself'; the reason alleged for this last prohibition being that danger might be done to the sculptured 'image of the Holy and Undivided Trinity,' and other ornaments on the wall between the chapel and the hall. After this comprehensive list of unlawful amusements, the reader may be inclined to ask, 'What recreations did the good bishop allow his scholars?' Only one seems contemplated by the statutes; the founder's experience of human nature told him that, 'after bodily refection by the taking of meat and drink, men are made more inclined to scurrilities, base talk, and (what is worse) detraction and strife'; he accordingly provides that on ordinary days, after the loving cup has gone round, there is to be no lingering in hall after dinner or supper (except for the usual 'potation' at curfew); but on festivals and other winter nights, 'on which, in honour of God and his Mother, or some other saint,' there is a fire in the hall, the Fellows are allowed to indulge in singing or reading 'poems, chronicles of the realm, and wonders of the world.'"

RECENT NOVELS.

The House of Martha. By Frank R. Stockton. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

The Squirrel Inn. By Frank R. Stockton. The Century Co.

Lord Arthur Savile's Crime, and Other Stories. By Oscar Wilde. Dodd, Mead & Co.

The Johnstown Stage, and Other Stories. By Robert Howe Fletcher. D. Appleton & Co.

Mr. Zinzan of Bath. By Mary Deane. E. P. Dutton & Co.

Dame Care. Translated from the German of Herman Suderman by Bertha Overbeck. Harper & Bros.

The Grandmother. By Bozena Nemec. Translated from the Bohemian by Frances Gregor. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

Countess Erika's Apprenticeship. Translated from the German of Ossip Schubin by Mrs. A. L. Wister. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

The Story of Francis Cludde. By Stanley J. Weyman. Cassell Publishing Co.

Ciphers. By Ellen Olney Kirk. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1891.

It is a singular frame of mind that one finds one's self in on reading 'The House of Martha.' A tale of genuine passion from the pen of Mr. Stockton seems almost a joke in itself; and it is perhaps to draw us up into the regions of emotion not too urgently, that these new-born loves and fears are attached to characters of the old Stocktonian type—dryly comical, solemnly grotesque. That a man who hires a listener to his own monologues should turn out to be the wildly impetuous hero of a romantic love story, gives one the same curious feeling that would arise on encountering Mrs. Aleshine (in perfectly dry clothing) at a meeting of the New York Historical Society, or on finding Pomona at the head of the State Charities Aid Association. There are moments of interest in the romance; there are moments of joy over the humor that flows from but one pen; there are yet other bewildering moments when the fun seems to be in one syllable and the characters no better fitted to mystery or to the tender passion than are Rollo and Lucy. One cannot say that the interest flags, but certainly it zigzags.

'The Squirrel Inn,' by the same author, is added proof that this writer's humor is too delicate, too prim, one might almost say, to lend itself effectively to plot. The present story in suggestion is dramatic, but its substance is too light and slight even for farce. One says at once, "How easily this would go on the stage; and how very dull it would be." Now what is thinner reading as a story than a dull farce? And yet the old charm peeps out in a tantalizing way—tantalizing because it sends the wishes back to the Stockton stories which are no more, but which we hope will be again.

Mr. Oscar Wilde's little volume might be called a collection of skits; and this attitude of the gentleman towards matters in general is a familiar one. Yet a subjectivity of method on his part, which all who were happy enough to see him in this country a few years ago will somewhat painfully remember, nearly disappears in his stories, leaving his method freer and himself a more agreeable satirist than might have been supposed. We detect little of the rebuking knee-breeches, or the exemplifying forelock here, while there is abundance of wit and invention. "The Canterville Ghost" and "The Sphinx without a Secret" are easily better than the two remaining sketches; in the former, the irreverent treatment by an American family of an English ancestral ghost is the happy subject of happy treatment. The story which gives the book its name is a stiffish dose of trying to be funny, but its opening chapter is worth reading for as clever a picture of a social function as we have lately seen. The volume is charmingly bound and printed, only the title-page of each story betraying any eccentricity, and so we may feel that we have got off as easily as could be expected.

We defy any one to open a book of stories nowadays and find it beginning with a sage-brush plain, a glaring sky, and a lonely stage station, without a momentary sympathy with the Man without a Country. Our Southern California maidens, with ragged shoes, black eyes, and many acres, our miners' camps, our sombreros, lariats, revolvers, and, most of all, our dialects, begin to recall *Richard II.'s*

"Patience is stale, and I am weary of it.
[*Beats the Keeper.*]"

Mr. Fletcher's stories are no worse than the others, perhaps better than many, but so hopelessly hackneyed are his landscape and figures that it is difficult to do justice to that half of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his tales which deals with the prairie or the Pacific Coast. While the remaining ones afford a few original positions, the characters are absolutely stereotyped. The general effect of the book, then, is mediocre, although the writer has a ready pen and a sense of form.

A cheerless foreboding of a holiday book assails one who picks up 'Mr. Zinzan of Bath,' in its inordinately large covers, its festal, harlequin binding, its wide margins, and profuse illustrations. Beauty is not always its own excuse for being, nor is there always a moral in being fair. 'Mr. Zinzan' proves to be no Christmas gift-book, but a fresh, pleasing little story set in attractive mounting; the story being one of loves and brave apparel—the scene, Bath in the days of George the Second, under the rule of Beau Nash. Pretty Mistress Dolly Chesney, with her adventures, gowns, and heartburns, during her first season—her minuets, masks, and snuff-boxes (which we learn with relief she carried but did not use)—running her daily round of gayety—floating about of a morning in the bath in wig and powder, and sipping chocolate—making conquests at the afternoon rout, and trembling through her first dance at the evening assembly before the dowagers, is a winning portrait. Another and a telling one is that of the great Beau himself, who glitters in pomp and power, denies royalty a dance after eleven o'clock, says "No" to aprons at the assembly and makes her Grace the Duchess drop hers at the door, lace though it be; the great Beau, who foreshadows our own McAllister, but in the added glory of buckles and ruffles, and diffusing a nimbus of powder with every stately bow. These and many other lifelike figures make up a lifelike view of the city where, as Thackeray says, "all history went and bathed and drank"—a view suggestive of history if not historic, albeit from these pages are absent the bigger bigwigs, a Walpole, a Chesterfield, a Pitt, who might figure in a Chronicle of Bath under the card-playing monarch.

Let not him who begins 'Dame Care' be discouraged by its commonplace tone at the outset from continuing the reading. Let him not be hindered by clumsiness in the translation or by the scent of the obsolete which clings round it still. Such phrases as "The coachmen with their shining buttons sat on their boxes with proud smiles and threw contemptuous glances all around"; "Oh, golly! the hussy has courage," might easily act as deterrents but for a friendly word of warning, and thus might be lost the acquaintance with a little story at once striking and poetic; sad with almost the sadness of Turgeneff, but blooming with more of the humanities than usually flourish on Russian soil. Paul Meyerhofer hears the fairy story of Dame Care from his mother, who, however, will never tell him the ending. He spends his life in learning it, and it is not until it is told in full on the last page that the completeness and artistic quality of the little book are wholly revealed. There are plenty of Teutonisms to be forgiven, but it well stands a searching test for any work of art, that of retrospect.

A story of Bohemia, translated from the Bohemian, is not published every day, and interest is bespoken besides for 'The Grandmother' by the biographical notice of the author which prefaces the story. Bozena Nemec's not numerous writings are dear to the hearts of Bohemians. She was one of the earlier authors among them, having been born in 1820, and having while still quite young gained popularity by her patriotic poems and stories. She and her husband were active in behalf of their country during the Revolution of 1848, and suffered for their zeal by being ever after suspiciously watched by the Government and forced into a struggle against cruel poverty. Mme. Nemec's love of her country and love for the peasantry were the leading motives in her work. She wrote in Bohemian (although the best of her education had been in German), that she might the more surely reach the hearts of her people. It is said that as a faithful delineator of Bohemian country life she has no equal, and certainly the present volume is a remarkably realistic account of the daily being, doing, suffering, and enjoying of an old peasant woman and her family and neighbors. Long and detailed as the chronicle is, it moves with an energetic spring not less characteristic of the narrative than of the sturdy, vivacious grandmother herself. A most agreeable idea is given of the Bohemian domestic hearth and of the loving optimism of family life. The Princess is more or less a figure-head, but Grandmother, with her superstitions, her horse-sense, and her loving heart, is beautifully alive, and so are the children who hang at her skirts—maidenly Borunka and sprite-like Adelka. Dogs, chickens, doves, deer, ants, and ladybugs are among the prominent characters, and in the main we find them as interesting as the children do, even if here and there, while Knowledge is flying about, saying "Take me," a rebellious reminiscence will arise of 'Evenings at Home' and 'Sandford and Merton.' On the whole, though the book can hardly be called a novel, it is interesting as a specimen of Bohemian literature, and as a mirror of manners and superstitions; while as a narrative it will please grandmothers, grandchildren, and those who love either class.

The grandchildren must decidedly not be given Ossip Schubin's latest work to read. This clever author begins to flaunt the defects of her virtues. Her stories, it is true, grow more firm and more inventive, but her development in that direction does not keep pace with the monstrous growth of her note-taking, which, having been her strong point heretofore, now threatens to swamp her other powers. The delineation of the manners of Vanity Fair is as lawful a field for a novel as the working out of a plot, but if it consists mainly of episodes which neither advance nor illumine the story, it cannot be called a well-constructed novel, though it may furnish amusing reading. Ossip Schubin has elected to describe, in 'Countess Erika's Apprenticeship,' the manners of aristocratic society in Berlin. No one under a countess figures in her pages, and princesses grow on every bush. There are, of course, a few artists wherewithal to stock the princesses' bear-gardens, but even they are all "vons." With few exceptions, the characters are a wicked and adulterous generation, and it is the list of their misdemeanors, either detailed or hinted, which, thinly clad in a story, supplies the real *raison d'être* of the book. The supreme struggles of the small fry to associate with the great, of the great to keep themselves supplied with scandals, subjective and objective, are only equalled by those of the writer to show an arm-in-arm intimacy with human nature, and more particularly with the aristocracy. The whirling of the scene from Berlin to Bayreuth and to Venice changes only the sky and not the mind. The Grand Canal, "Parsifal," the Thiergarten, are simply pegs on which to hang the same clever but shallow feats of pen, the same display of knowingness. There is an air of cheerful alacrity about the vices of Ossip Schubin's world which is wanting to its reluctant and perfunctory virtues. Wit and the wish to be caustic are not absent, and in a superficial sense the story is entertaining. If the world loves anything better than a lover, it is a lord, even in his sins. So has it been ever since the immortal Evelina's cousin cried, "Law! Polly, Miss danced with a lord!" Here may be found, then, the charm of fine names and titles, and of all, in short, that is included in the Indian boy's definition of "unwieldy wealth," namely, "dazzling gauds and plenty too much elephants." Apropos of 'Countess Erika,' a passing query suggests itself: What is the connection between the persistent use of the present tense in novels and a certain style of story which it invariably accompanies? Intensely modern it always is, and modernly intense, reeking with the world, the flesh, and the devil. The heroine, here and usually, renounces all three at last in favor of the only suitor who is not a roué, but the real fun of the thing is over then; the gist of the book has been the author's acquaintance with methods of getting into intrigues and out of them.

No one can wonder that the writer, in a preface, congratulates herself upon having Mrs. Wister for a translator, nor that she authorizes the present translation to the exclusion of every other one.

Stanley Weyman, already favorably known as the author of 'The House of the Wolf,' now gives us 'The Story of Francis Cludde.' Both are historical novels or novelettes, and if the earlier book, considered as history, might have borne the sub-title, 'The Massacre of Saint Bartholomew Made Easy,' the present volume could be called 'Bloody Mary in the n^{th} Dilution.' No doubt, for story-telling purposes, dilution is to be desired, and this is certainly a commendable story, being full of interest and told with great spirit. Master Francis Cludde, a hot-headed young Englishman, runs away from his home in Warwickshire to carve his own fortunes. In London he falls in with the Duchess of Suffolk and her kinswoman, who are fleeing to Holland to escape Catholic persecution. Holland, in 1555, it will be surmised, soon becomes a very hot place for even English Protestants. Many and wild are the adventures of the little group, now enlarged by the Duchess's husband and a Dutch Protestant family, in getting out of Holland with their heads on their shoulders. How they did it—how they came back in later times to England, and how Master Cludde made an honorable name for himself—all is told in an animated style, while the interest of suspense is admirably maintained. It is a capital book for the young, and even the less hardened nerves of the middle-aged will find here no superfluity of gore or brutality to mar their pleasure in a bright and clean tale of prowess and adventure.

The application of the aphorism—"Ciphers forget their integer"—with which Mrs. Kirk begins her new novel, 'Ciphers,' is not altogether clear; but it is evident enough that most of the characters represented in this story of modern New York society life are ciphers; though they might readily make the mistake of imagining themselves integers. The beautiful and wealthy widow who creates a sensation on her reappearance in society, and the manly young architect with whom she falls in love, have enough inherent character to give them some value and to save the reader from drearily echoing the words of the Preacher, "All is vanity." Yet in spite of the breath of fresh air which these two chief actors bring into drawing-rooms crowded with the trivial appurtenances which suggest, accord-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to the author, the "acme of civilization," the story leaves one unrefreshed and unstimulated. The principal figures are not drawn vigorously enough to produce a very marked impression or to compensate for the inanities of the others. And a novel that fails to brighten life or to enrich it has surely failed of its purpose.

THE NON-EUCLIDEAN GEOMETRY.

Geometrical Researches on the Theory of Parallels. By Nicholaus Lobatchewsky. Translated from the original by George Bruce Halsted, A.M., Ph.D., ex-Fellow of Princeton College and Johns Hopkins University, Professor of Mathematics in the University of Texas. Austin. 1891.

LOBACHEVSKI'S little book, 'Geometrische Untersuchungen,' marks an epoch in the history of thought, that of the overthrow of the axioms of geometry. The philosophical consequences of this are undoubtedly momentous, and there are thinkers who hold that it must lead to a new conception of nature, less mechanical than that which has guided the steps of science since Newton's discovery. The book has been published many years—in fact, the essence of it was set forth before 1830; so long does it take a pure idea to make its way, unbacked by any interest more aggressive than the love of truth. In this case, the idea is lucid, easy, and convincing. Nobody with enough mathematical capacity to be able to understand the first book of geometry need fear the least difficulty in mastering Lobachevski's tract; and really it is high time that every thinking man and woman should know what is in it.

In the pre-Lobachevskian days, elementary geometry was universally regarded as the very exemplar of conclusive reasoning carried to great lengths. It had been the ideal of speculative thinkers in all ages. Metaphysics, indeed, as an historical fact, has been nothing but an attempt to copy, in thinking about substances, the geometer's reasoning about shapes. This is shown by the declarations of Plato and others, by the spatial origin of many metaphysical conceptions and of the terms appropriated to them, such as *abstract*, *form*, *analogy*, etc., and by the love of donning the outer clothing of geometry, even when no fit for philosophy. For instance, one of the remarkable features of geometry is the small number of premises from which galaxies of theorems result; and accordingly it has been the effort of almost all metaphysicians to reduce their first principles to the fewest possible, even if they had to crowd disparate thoughts into one formu'a. It did not seem to occur to them that since a list of first principles is a work of analysis, it would not be a small number of elementary propositions so much as a large number that would bespeak its thoroughness. Admiration for the elements of geometry was not, however, confined to metaphysicians. Euclid's treatise was acknowledged by all kinds of minds to be all but absolutely perfect in its reasoning, and the very type of what science should aim at as to form and matter.

In the empyrean of geometry there was but one little speck—the theory of parallels. Euclid had had a difficulty in proving the sum of the angles of a triangle to be not less than two right angles. His treatment of the subject betrays a very profound study of it; for instead of slipping over the difficulty unaware, as forty-nine out of fifty mathematicians would have done, instead of even bringing the necessary assumption to a persuasive shape, he takes as his fifth postulate (or 11th axiom, in incorrect editions) a proposition that begs the question in the frankest manner—namely, if two straight lines in a plane are met by a third making the sum of the inner angles on one side of this third less than two right angles, then these two lines will meet on that side if sufficiently produced. Innumerable attempts were made to demonstrate this; but, at length, the efforts of Legendre and others made it pretty clear that this proposition could be deduced only from some other nearly equivalent. The least unsatisfactory assumption ever proposed was that of Playfair, that if of three unlimited straight lines lying in one plane two intersect, the third must cross one or both. It was at this point that Lobachevski cut the knot by supposing Euclid's postulate untrue, and showing that the result was a perfectly consistent system of geometry which may, for all we can yet observe, be the system of nature. All this time, Euclid's proof (Elements, Bk. I., props. 16 and 17) of what substantially amounts to the proposition, that the sum of the three angles of a triangle are *not greater* than two right angles, was regarded as perfect. It was not till 1854 that Riemann first discovered that, though accepted for two thousand years as conclusive (and it stands to-day unchanged in almost all the text-books), this pretended proof is really quite fallacious. It is plain that it is so, because it uses no premises not as true in the case of spherical as in that of plane triangles; and yet the conclusion drawn from those premises is known to be false of spherical triangles.

The truth is, that elementary geometry, instead of being the perfection of human reasoning, is riddled with fallacies, and is thoroughly unmathematical in its method of development. It has in some measure confused all mathematics, by leaving unnoticed most of the really fundamental propositions, while raising to an undue rank certain others almost arbitrarily selected. It leads young men into bad logical ways; and it causes pupil and teacher to think that whoever has difficulty with this sophisticated logic is wanting in aptitude for the apprehension of mathematics. The study of geometry ought to begin with the theory of perspective. Let a man be supposed to stand on an unbroken sandy plain. Let him fix a needle upon a post, and set up a plate of glass in a steady position, and draw a perspective picture upon the glass by placing his eye so as to bring the needle point over each point in the sand to be represented and marking it on the glass in the same line of sight. The horizon is where the lines of sight just skim the surface of the rounded earth. These lines of sight form a cone, and their perspective representation will be the section of this cone by the plane of the glass. But for simplicity let it be supposed that the earth is flat and indefinitely extended, so that the *plain* is also a *plane*, and an unbounded one. Then every straight line in the sand will have a straight line for its picture, for all the lines of sight from the needle-point to points in that straight line will lie in one plane; and this plane will cut the plane of the glass in a straight line.

Lobachevski and Riemann cast no manner of doubt upon the geometry of perspective, so far as this is confined to questions of incidence and coincidence. But when it comes to the measurement of distances and angles, their objections begin. According to the Euclidean notions, the infinitely distant parts of an unbounded plane would be represented in perspective by a straight horizon or vanishing line. But Lobachevski says we cannot be sure that this line would be straight, that may be it would be a hyperbola like the perspective of the terrestrial horizon; and, in fact, the straight line being only a special case of the hyperbola, it is proper to say that such is its form. Riemann, however, points out that we cannot even be sure there would be any such line at all, for we cannot be sure that space has any infinitely distant parts, since it may be that if we were to move off in any direction in a straight line, we might find that, after traversing a sufficient distance, we had got around to our starting-point again.

Prof. Halsted's translation (which, while our notice has been waiting, has reached, we are glad to see, a fourth edition) is excellent; his useful bibliography of non-Euclidean geometry was already well known. We could only wish there were a more copious appendix. The work of Lobachevski, though simple and convincing, is not what would now be considered a scientific presentation of the subject, and is open to a good deal of criticism. A new synthetic exposition is much needed, and might well accompany a collection of the contributions of Lobachevski, Bolzai, Riemann, Cayley, Klein, and Clifford.

JAMES SMETHAM.

Letters of James Smetham. With an introductory memoir. Edited by Sarah Smetham and William Davies. Macmillan & Co.

THE name of James Smetham will call up to only a very limited circle of art students in England any associations. He was an instance of a type of man, not uncommon in English stock, rarely to be found in any other, in whom extreme sensibility in moral, intellectual, and æsthetic nature alike, without great strength, intellectually or physically, gives some of the best early fruits of culture, and wears out the machine it drives just when people look for something great from so much earnestness and so correct an estimate of the task in view. Writing verses at nine years and taking to art early, with the burthen of a religious tendency which we can hardly exaggerate in calling morbid, Smetham forced the note of a conscience which dominated whatever he did, and ended, as was to be apprehended, if not foreseen, in insanity, before he reached sixty. The last eleven years of his life were passed in intellectual night. Some of his early work had attracted the attention of Ruskin, ever sympathetic with all that had the tinge of devotional in art; and in a letter to the critic, Smetham tells the story of his efforts and his development.

At eight he decided to become a painter, was apprenticed to an architect, got rid of his indentures by showing his incapacity and reluctance to do what was set for him, quite as much as by his pertinacity in following pictorial art, and finally got consent to go his way. If he had had an education of the kind that the painters of the fifteenth century got, he might have become a remarkable painter, never a great one, except as Fra Angelico was great. In fact, his temperament was more akin to that of the Beato than to that of the Frate's great pupil Benozzo Gozzoli; and, but for his having been born and bred a Methodist, he might have been an ecstatic like the Angelico. But, instead of this, he went to the school of the Royal Academy, the last place in the world to learn anything but to sharpen crayons and draw from the antique with them; and presently he began to paint, his own master, like so many more in England; and, like most of them, only learning late what he ought

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have been taught in the very beginning. The Royal Academy did not work him the harm it generally does to men of his temperament, for he remained only a few months there. But he gained a living by painting portraits (though, later, photography broke off this resource), and the usual struggle of young painters working without help or patronage began. He went into the country to live, after his few months in the Royal Academy school, and a passage in his letter of autobiography to Ruskin is the prediction of his final eclipse:

"I went into the neighborhood of Bolton Abbey, where my father then resided; and here you will understand me when I speak of the great change which came over my life. The death of my brother [a Wesleyan minister in London] cast a great shade over my wild dreams and extravagant ambitions. I did a great deal for his approbation, and when he had gone my spirit followed him. I perceived that to attain to him was not a matter of fancy or speculation, and 'the commandment' came to me. A complete uproar and chaos of my inward life followed, and I fell into the 'slough of despond.' The beauty of nature mocked me, my fancies became ghosts. I felt my discordances with the spiritual universe; and it was not till my father also died that my soul was stilled and set in order. I had worked on (except for one dreadful period of four months, when I could not work at all though in perfect health) wearily and painfully; but now I resumed my pursuits with new zest, and devised the plans of study, some of the results of which you have seen. . . . A salutary fear shut me up in a happy seclusion, and I could not precipitate myself into the battle of life; so I went on painting portraits and interspersing them with fancy pictures, gaining money enough to keep me, and then snatching a month or two for study; now in a large town, now in a little one, now in a remote farm painting the farmer and his family, and roaming in his fields, and by the edge of his plantations; then in London."

It is not difficult to see here the symptoms of the mental disease which later came over him. Whether it might have been possible for him to cure the morbid and fatal tendency by a vigorous wrestle with humanity and getting calloused by the process, it is impossible to say; but if there were any hope for a healthy development of his talent and mental activity, it would have been only there. His seclusion, his giving the lead to the moodiness which many men who can recall their early years of poetical impression will recognize, were the surest tendencies to destroy his intellectual equilibrium; and if his Life has any value for those who read it, it will be that it is an illustration of the way in which minds over-inclined to introspection and spinning their mental fabrics from their spiritual natures tend towards a collapse. Ruskin, who had the same tendency, seems to have had a perception of it in Smetham, for he writes to him on the occasion of receiving from him a drawing on which the artist had bestowed great labor and feeling:

"I have hardly ever seen any work of the kind carried so far as the drawing in the principal face. I shall indeed value it very highly; but if, indeed, you think any words or thoughts of mine have ever been true to you, pray consider these to be the truest, that it is unsafe for you, with your peculiar temperament, to set yourself subjects of this pathetic and exciting kind for some time to come. Your health is not sturdy; you are not satisfied with what you do, and have to do some work which is irksome and tedious to you. If your work is divided between that which is tedious and that which tries your feeling and intellect to the utmost, no nervous system can stand it; and you should, I am very strongly persuaded, devote yourself to drawing and painting pretty faces, and things involving little thought or pathos, until, your skill being perfectly developed, you find yourself able to touch the higher chords without effort."

Smetham's was an essentially devotional nature—not merely religious in the sense of being governed by the immanent eternal law and divine presence, but dependent on the emotional activity which, where not united to a sound constitution and a robust frame, provides so many of the inmates of our lunatic asylums. To him the sense of the dominance over himself of the divine law and the willing obedience to it were not enough for conscience—he must be perpetually awakening the emotional illusions of the spiritual presence in that conscious state which is in itself a step towards insanity—perpetually feeling of his spiritual nature to be assured that it was there, like a man in a dream touching his body to be assured that it is himself. This is a condition in itself symptomatic of mental disease, and in another epoch, or another country, would have sent Smetham into a monastery; but in the condition in which he lived, it simply determined the wearing out of his mental machinery by the manifold charges on it. In one of his letters he gives utterance to the following rhapsody, which, with all its exaltation, is clearly only the expression of his habitual temper, what he was moved to in all his waking hours:

"It is the Truth that lives. This evening, going round the fields and lanes, on my old steps of thirteen years ago—the same gray twilight, sharp air, and pensive gold purple sunset over Highgate—my heart glowed within me as I thought how my life has changed by the belief of a few simple things since those old days. I thanked God aloud. I sent some plain expressions of praise upward to the heavens, where I saw one white star in the gray, tender blue eastward; such expressions as I could scarcely repeat, so unlike me to say aloud were they; but I could not help it. My heart was glowing silently like that star in the heavens. A star is ever the same. All that we know of it was known by the Shepherds of the East—by us as children—but it is for ever there. The leaves are tossing on the grass, or perishing in the pool, but the star is simple and the same. The leaf is not so simple to us as the star, it is not so grand, it is not so ineffable. I find the Truth to be like that: I know no more intellectually of it than when I first believed; but what a result comes from its abiding! A deeper, deeper happiness absorbs the heart and pervades the soul. A deepening calm rules and assimilates the faculties, and compels them into action; not excitement, but definite and proper action. The peace of God, which passes all understanding, which baffles all analysis, which has an infinitude of depth about it—as you cannot understand remote stars, nor the overhanging vault which you cannot at all explore, but can only feel as you feel your life, so you cannot touch this Peace of God with your understanding. It lies round you like an atmosphere. It dwells in you like a fragrance. It goes from you like a subtle elixir vitæ. 'My peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you.'"

With the exception of part of the latter sentences of this quotation, there is in it nothing that does not show the naïve and unaffected expression of the man himself with no atmosphere of the pulpit. If a little verbiage envelops the definition of the Truth (with a capital T), it is not strange; the letters are in the vein of a diary, and all diarists know that to write simply and unconsciously is the next thing to the impossible. Smetham's perceptions of the truths of art show that his feeling was the true one, and that, had he been wisely taught, he might have made his mark in the century. Speaking of the Turner sketches at Marlborough House, he says: "They confirm what I have long believed to be true, that in preparing for painting the best way is not to paint finished things from Nature, but to make slight, often symbolic, records, in abundance, of facts. There is scarcely an instance of a finished sketch of effect directly from Nature in all Turner." He did not take kdinly to pre-Raphaelitism. Speaking of some landscapes by Rembrandt, he says: "The pre-Raffaelite dicta of ten years ago would have laid these landscapes dead. The 'awe of observation,' peeping, and botanizing, and protesting, and putting the screw on square inches, would slay all such art, and it is the grandest of all." There is a most interesting letter of description of a visit to Denmark Hill, when Ruskin was there, and his father and mother still alive, and the portraits of the three are of the best:

"His father is a fine old gentleman who has a lot of bushy gray hair, and eyebrows sticking up all rough and knowing, with a comfortable way of coming up to you with his hands in his pockets and making you comfortable, and saying, in answer to your remark, that 'John's' prose works are pretty good. His mother is a ruddy, dignified, richly dressed old gentlewoman of seventy-five, who knows Chamounix better than Camberwell; evidently a good old lady, with the *Christian Treasury* tossing about on the table. She puts 'John' down and holds her own opinions, and flatly contradicts him; and he receives all her opinions with a soft reverence and gentleness that is pleasant to witness."

The brief sketch of Ruskin is perhaps recognizable in its complete truth only by those who knew him in that phase of his life, and is "worth framing."

"I wish I could reproduce a good impression of John for you, to give you the notion of his 'perfect gentleness and lowlihood.' He certainly bursts out with a remark, and in a contradictious way, but only because he believes it, with no air of dogmatism or conceit. He is different at home from that which he is in a lecture before a mixed audience, and there is a spiritual sweetness in the half-timid expression of his eyes; and in bowing to you, as in taking wine, with (if I heard aright) 'I drink to thee,' he had a look that has followed me, a look bordering on the tearful."

The book has a value in no ways proportional to the position which the artist took in the world of art. It betrays the complete image of a man who was a true artist by temperament and mental outfit, but who failed of the success which is the real object of labor, from the want of the correct education in living and in art which is necessary to technical mastery, and from causes which are always potent in the life of men who approach art in the modern condition and in the modern temperament. He was far from a great man, though he might have been a very distinguished one but for the dispersion of his energy and the sapping of his intellectual powers by the morbid devotionalism which found no counteracting influence in his practical life. His was a true and characteristic life because true to its morbid type, and therefore an instructive one—a life for a warning, not for an example.

The Financier and the Finances of the American Revolution. By William Graham Sumner. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1891.

THE problem to which the colonies and the confederation devoted most of their attention was how to carry on a war without taxing themselves for the maintenance of an army. As Prof. Sumner puts it, "It seemed to be accepted by everybody as a rational and correct view of the situation, that, of course, taxes could not be laid, because the fight was against taxation. We have not met with a single case in which anybody undertook to point out the distinction between resisting all taxation and resisting taxation which was not levied upon due authority; nor have we found one case in which anybody argued that the people had intelligently undertaken to resist the authority of Great Britain, and that they could or would subject themselves to the neces-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sary cost of it, in money and military effort, like men." In point of fact, the idea that taxation was necessary to the existence of society, an idea which seems to us elementary enough, was scarcely comprehended in the colonial period, for the excellent reason that society as then constituted existed practically without taxation. There was not much government nor very much need of it. The colony was "a congeries of coöperative land companies," and the taxes in these communities "were really nothing but the subscriptions of a club." Since they rebelled against Great Britain simply because she taxed them, it is perhaps not very surprising that their leaders hesitated to tell them that by their revolt they had only made taxes more inevitable.

Under these circumstances the governments of the Revolution were driven to resort to the most desperate expedients. The revolt against British taxation led to the suspension of most of the slight taxes that had been levied by the colonial governments, and we find the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, two weeks before the battle of Bunker Hill, grasping eagerly at the report that there was a man in Salem who had £500 which he was willing to lend them. "It would be of the greatest importance to pay the soldiers, and might prevent the greatest mischief." At the outset some money appears to have been raised in this way, but the inducements to resort to the issue of paper currency were too strong to be resisted. It depreciated at once, of course, and then followed a series of measures intended to force people to part with their goods in exchange for this paper, the particulars of which are given by Prof. Sumner, and which could end in only one way. These enactments, however, did for a time terrify some persons into giving up their goods, and were especially convenient in plundering the Tories. But revenue so gained was not all profit, as the Tories retaliated by plundering the Whigs when they got a chance. In the course of three or four years all the devices that human folly and passion could suggest were exhausted. Specie had been driven out of use, the Continental currency had expired amid universal execration, and the business of the country was reduced to a system of barter.

It might seem that at last a resort to taxation had become inevitable, but, happily or unhappily, one other expedient remained. According to the theories of the age, colonial trade was a vast source of wealth to any nation that engaged in it, and there was from the beginning a good deal of hope that, by offering their trade to the rivals of Great Britain, the colonies might procure some substantial assistance. At this critical juncture these hopes were beginning to be realized, although the attempt to stop the trade with Great Britain had only resulted in making it illicit—both Congress and the States prohibiting it to their subjects, while they engaged in it themselves. The appetites of the French had been early whetted by stories of the enormous profits made in this traffic—the gain from a successful voyage to the West Indies sometimes being enough to balance the loss of two vessels with their cargoes—and the French Government seems at first to have intended to confine the expression of its sympathy with the colonists to allowing them to market their products in France. The address of the American Commissioners, however, was such as to induce the foreigners to part with their goods before they were paid for them, and eventually to induce the French Government to make loans in money. This was exactly what the colonists most desired, and the question of repayment by shipment of supplies, or in any other way, lost much of its interest. The success of the French and American arms in the latter years of the war produced the conviction abroad that independence would be won, and borrowing became easier; for it was thought, justly, as the event proved, that, after the States had secured their independence, they would easily carry their burden of indebtedness.

It was early in 1781 that Robert Morris was unanimously elected by Congress Superintendent of Finance, an office created for him and in which he had no successor. He was commonly spoken of as the Financier, and that title is inscribed upon his tombstone. He was a man of affairs, a merchant, banker, and speculator, and he made it a condition of taking office that he should be permitted to continue his private business. He could, of course, not expect much remuneration from Congress, but as it was necessary under the circumstances to speculate on their behalf as well as his own, the resulting confusion of accounts gave his enemies a chance to bring ugly charges against him. There seems to have been no reason to doubt his honesty, and as he freely used his own credit in raising supplies for the public, bringing some kind of order out of financial chaos and greatly reducing expenditure, the balance may be said to have been heavily on his side, although the accounts made him out a debtor.

The importance of Morris's appointment lay in the fact that it put the management of the finances into the hands of an executive officer, it having previously been controlled by a committee of Congress, under whose incompetent direction the most deplorable waste and corruption had occurred. Prof. Sumner does not give us a very clear idea of what reforms Morris effected, but he quotes a statement that it had cost Congress $18,000,000 a year in hard money to carry on the war, while under Morris's administration the cost was reduced to $4,000,000. For one thing, Morris insisted on controlling his own subordinates, although Congress was extremely reluctant to give up this patronage. His understanding of what ought to be done was clear enough, but his attempts to make the States pay their quotas to the general Government seem to have produced little result. He was driven to undertake a general mercantile business on behalf of the Government, buying, selling, exporting, and importing commodities by the ship's cargo. He established the Banks of Pennsylvania and of North America, which proved of some convenience, and he engaged extensively in operations in the exchange market, some of which at least were sheer "bill-kiting." At all events, it may be said the country managed under his administration of the finances to struggle through three most critical years, and when he resigned, the success of the loans made in Holland relieved us of our most pressing difficulties.

There are numberless matters of interest touched upon by Prof. Sumner to which we are tempted to refer, but we can only advise our readers to consult his work for themselves. It is furnished with a copious list of authorities and a full index, and the thanks of his countrymen are due to the author for the immense labor which he has performed—a labor which is not less valuable because it simply subserves historical truth, and has not been affected by any disposition to extenuate the failings of the period. The glories of the time have been elsewhere sufficiently dwelt upon. As a matter of fact, the country came through the Revolution without exhaustion, and throughout the war the army may be said to have been starving in the midst of plenty. The utter lack of administrative organization, the absence of financial experience, and the timidity of the leaders which prevented them from calling upon the people for taxes, nearly wrecked a cause which there were abundant resources to sustain. The colonies are said to have raised an army of 25,000 men during the Seven Years' War, and during the Revolution they never maintained more than 30,000 at any one time.

So far as Morris as an individual is concerned, Prof. Sumner's portrait is but a faint and colorless outline. He learned evil ways in administering the distressed finances of the nation, but his subsequent ruin was due entirely to his wild speculations in land. His services were evidently believed at the time to be most important, and though he took office at a period when the conditions were beginning to turn in our favor, his labors were sufficiently arduous to entitle him to the honor of posterity. He declared, in words which Prof. Sumner places on his title-page, "It is of the nature of expedients to increase the evils which they postpone"; but a policy of expedients was forced upon him, and he made the best of the situation.

A Brave Black Regiment. History of the Fifty-fourth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, 1863–1865. By Luis F. Emilio. 8vo, pp. xvi., 410. The Boston Book Co.

Captain Emilio has written a modest, candid, and full history of the colored regiment made famous by its charge upon the parapet of Fort Wagner, where Colonel Robert G. Shaw died at its head. It was the pioneer organization of black troops and had a just preëminence on that account. Fully weighing the importance of the experiment, Governor Andrew determined to give to it a corps of officers selected with exceptional care, and to be rigid in excluding from the rank and file all unhealthy and weak recruits. The result was an organization which bore the fatigue and exposure of camp life with uncommon success. Its ranks were always full and always ready for duty.

Its military career was an honorable one, though both the more important engagements in which it had part turned out unfortunately. The attack upon Wagner was repulsed because there was no unity in the assault by the several regiments engaged in it, and so the heroism of Shaw's regiment, as well as of others, was wasted. The fault was not with the regimental officers, who did their duty nobly. Their other battle was that of Olustee in Florida, when the little army to which they belonged was defeated, but the Fifty-fourth performed well the honorable and perilous duty of covering the retreat. Their skirmishes and minor engagements were numerous, but they were not accompanied by the stimulus and the éclat of success on a large field, and the whole service of the regiment was rather a steady and faithful one than one of marked brilliancy. The roster shows that the recruiting for the regiment was not confined to Massachusetts, but was active in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. Nearly every free State had some representation in the ranks, and the regiment was therefore rightly considered a typical one, exhibiting the military aptitude of the free colored men of the country. Later in the war, very great numbers of freedmen were enlisted, but neither in education, in habits of self-respect, nor in the train-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing under carefully chosen officers, could they be expected to rival the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts. The whole subject of the actual value of the colored troops has as yet been very imperfectly studied, and would well repay a searching investigation from a strictly military point of view, to determine whether their enlistment and use was in fact an economy of the military resources of the country.

The narrative makes it very clear that Col. Shaw's regiment was orderly, well-disciplined, and brave. It had some peculiar discouragements to contend with. First of these was the threat of outlawry on the part of the Confederacy against officers and men of black and mulatto regiments. The warning given by the United States Government that severe retaliation would follow any treatment of them contrary to the laws of war, protected the captured, apparently, though the massacre at Fort Pillow was horrid proof that quarter could be refused on little or no pretext. A small number of the Fifty-fourth were taken prisoners and were surrendered at Wilmington just before the close of the war. The Confederacy, however, had, up to that time, refused to exchange colored prisoners, and the doubt as to his fate if captured must have hung over every colored man who enlisted. Besides this, the Fifty-fourth had a special grievance in regard to its pay. Mr. Stanton's authorization to Gov. Andrew to raise colored regiments preceded the act of Congress on the subject, which fixed the pay at a lower rate than for white men. The recruiting officers of the Massachusetts regiment offered to enlisted men the same pay as others received, in good faith, but without authority of law. When the time for payment came, the regiment refused to take the lower pay, even under protest. The Massachusetts Legislature appropriated State funds to make up the difference, but the non-commissioned officers and men made it a question of principle, and maintained their position till Congress awarded them the full pay, eighteen months after their service had begun. No better proof of loyalty and good discipline could be given than is found in their steady obedience to orders during the long delay, very few cases of insubordination being reported. Capt. Emilio's history does not enter as fully into either of these questions as is desirable for historical purposes, for there were two sides to the discussion, as is usual. He gives the side of the regiment, as they felt it, warmly but temperately, assuming that there could be no debate as to the injustice of their treatment by the national Government.

The book should be welcomed as an important chapter of our war history, well presented, and well illustrated by good maps and good portraits of the men of both races who carried the muskets as well as the sabres.

Japanese Letters. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS book purports to be a collection of private letters from two Japanese, which have been "edited" by Commander Hastings Berkeley, R. N., author of 'Wealth and Welfare.' They profess to give, as the sub-title advertises, "Eastern impressions of Western men and manners, as contained in the correspondeuce of Tokiwara and Yashiri." Tokiwara is the "representative of young Japan," who has left the land of earthquakes and attempts at Parliament, and is travelling in Egypt, England, and the Continent. The youthful enthusiast is set over against the aged and sober Yashiri, who remains at home, conservative in politics and sceptical of the benefits promised to his country by the infusion of Occidental ideas. England is the country from which Tokiwara believes Japan is to learn the secret of industrial and political supremacy. Like so many Japanese, he hopes that Nippon is to become "the England of the East." Yashiri, on the other hand, distrusts the power of his æsthetically-minded fellow-islanders to become a business nation. The national temperament is impulsive, while the striking quality of the English is "their power of self-restraint, their reluctance to undertake more than they feel they can carry out." Mightily impressed with London is the young traveller, and the intensity and permanency of endeavor in the Briton are constant surprises to him. With a philosophical power and coloring of language that is wholly English, this young Japanese, doubtless faultlessly clothed by the tailors of Ludgate Hill, discusses, in a suspiciously Occidental and un-Japanese style of thought, religion, science, fashion, politics, art, and education.

The "editor" of these letters, who modestly ascribes to Yashiri and Tokiwara his own cogitations and criticisms, has succeeded in soaking out the last watermarks of real Japanese thought, and in translating away all native idiom and peculiarities. True, he introduces here and there a Japanese word, and then obligingly turns it into English in a foot-note. The skill which he has shown, however, in destroying the moulds of Japanese thought and in obliterating the native canvas-texture beneath the English paint and varnish, is worthy of nobler work. The Englishman whose religion is "British interests," and the club-man and naval officer who enjoys ventriloquizing his opinions, is manifest in every chapter. We should mark paragraphs on pp. 23 and 29 as strong evidences of this. The "editor" has evidently seen Japan from the deck of a man-of-war, and probably picked up many notions about the Japanese, so that he is well able to compare, for example, the uses of the pocket-handkerchief and the nose-paper on different sides of the Pacific. Every Japanese familiar with the facts knows that "our three hundred feudal nobles in 1869" did not spontaneously (p. 252) relinquish their "fiefs, feudal power, and military splendor," but that the stronger compelled the weaker to do so. The few men of personal importance gave the many figure-heads to understand that blood and destruction awaited them unless they at once complied with the orders given in the Emperor's name. Very properly the "editor" brings his chapters to an end after likening the Japanese to the French mind in love of ideas, and making a complimentary reference to Thomas Carlyle. The true author of these essays has given us, under the thin disguise of letters labelled Japanese—which are Japanese in the same sense as are Sullivan's music and opera singers—an interesting contribution to the discussion of the subject of Japan's attempt to appropriate Western civilization. Even in their earnest search for religion, for the basis of morality, for the best government, the people of Japan are worthy of all sympathy. And this quality the editor shows commendably, despite the catch-penny title of his book.

Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry from the Earliest Times of the Republic to the Augustan Age. Edited by W. W. Merry, D.D. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan & Co. 1891.

IT was a good idea of Dr. Merry's to give in a convenient form a representative selection from the fragments of Roman epic, dramatic, and satiric poetry. To most men, Latin epic poetry means Vergil, satire means Horace and Juvenal, with sometimes Persius, while Roman drama is utterly unknown. For of course in Plautus and Terence there is hardly anything Roman except their mere language. The fact is, we know nothing of real Roman drama except what we can learn from the remains of the tragedies, praetextæ, and togatæ, written by such men as Livius, Ennius, Nævius, Pacuvius, and Afranius. Nor can one understand the growth and thoroughly appreciate the perfection of the later epic and satire without having studied the fragments of the earlier writers in the same kinds of poetry. Of course, material for such study has not been wanting, but it has been scattered about in different books, and these have generally been too large or too difficult for the beginner. Dr. Merry's collection is therefore welcome, and will doubtless be more useful than his modesty allows him to hope. We are more than glad to forgive him for attempting nothing himself in the lines of textual criticism and metrical arrangement, since he offers English readers the results of the work of such scholars as Ribbeck, Vahlen, Baehrens, Riese, and L. Müller.

The book contains selections from about forty poets, as well as some early formulæ, the Scipio epitaphs, and popular songs. Some of these poets we have already mentioned. Among others are Turpilius, Accius, Lucilius, the two Varros, Cicero, and Cinna. A brief word of introduction might have been said about each of them—at least their dates should have been given—but the notes are confined to a summary of the contents of the fragments and to the explanation of a few of the more difficult terms. On the whole, the beginner wants more notes everywhere than Dr. Merry gives him—notes like those in Allen's admirable edition of the 'Remnants of Early Latin.' Most valuable, however, are the suggestions about the plots of the lost plays of which we have fragments. In the ordinary editions only the bare Latin is provided, and the task of making sense and connection is worse than a Chinese puzzle. It is good to find that at last some praise is accorded in an English book to the work which Cicero did in poetry. Ridiculed as his muse has been, its productions yet show a real advance in the matter of form, if not in thought. Lucretius and Catullus are not the only stations in the long journey from Ennius to Vergil, and hexameters like those which Cicero and a few others have left behind them mark the stages of development which resulted finally in the 'Æneid.' The perfection of the Vergilian form can no more be appreciated by one who has not studied the earlier hexameters than can the lyric metres of Horace by one who knows nothing of their Greek models.

We have noticed a few misprints here and there, such as the references to Terentius Scaurus and to Festus on the first page, and on page 16 *Menippae* for *Menippeae*. Of errors may be noted *immulgens* for *inmulgens* (p. 13), as well as *nefrens* for *nefrendes*. In a revision it would be well for the editor to consult both here and elsewhere De Ponor's Festus. The statement (p. 2) '*rue=ruinam*,' with '*lue=luem*' preceding it, is misleading. The metre in the quotation from Nævius on page 23 requires *utrubi*, not *uterubi*, and the former is what Charisius gives in the place cited. It is perhaps trusting one's authorities too far when a line quoted as a senarius by Gellius is printed as a saturnian by Dr. Merry (p. 4), following without a word of warning the wholesale rearrangement of Baehrens. Still, all these are tri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fling blots, easily removed, on what promises to be a useful handbook.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

A Kempis, Thomas. Meditations on the Life of Christ. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.25.
Andrews, Rev. S. J. Life of Our Lord upon Earth. Scribners. $2.50.
Burnham, Mrs. C. L. Miss Bagg's Secretary. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Cambridge, Ada. Not All in Vain. Appletons.
Cobb, Sylvanus, Jr. Bion the Wanderer. Cassell. 50 cents.
Collins, Clinton. All Poetry: A Selection of English Verse. Cincinnati: The Traddles Co. 70 cents.
Coltman, Robert, Jr. The Chinese: Their Present and Future: Medical, Political and Social. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.
Conway, M. D. Prisons of Air. United States Book Co. 50 cents.
Crushed Yet Conquering. F. H. Revell Co. $2.40.
Davis, N. S., Jr. Consumption: How to Prevent It and How to Live with It. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis. 75 cents.
Eschstruth, Nataly von. The Wild Rose of Gross-Stauffen. Worthington Co.
Evolution in Science, Philosophy and Art. Appletons.
Fabbri, Cora. Lyrics. Harpers.
Farjeon, B. L. For the Defence. John W. Lovell Co. 50 cents.
Fawcett, Edgar. Women Must Weep. Chicago: Laird & Lee. 50 cents.
Flower, Prof. W. H. The Horse. Appletons. $1.
Ford, W. C. Letters of William Lee. 3 vols. Brooklyn: Historical Printing Co. $12.
Freytag, Gustav. The Lost Manuscript. Chicago: The *Open Court* Publishing Co. $1.
Fullerton, W. M. In Cairo. Macmillan.
Gotch, J. A. Architecture of the Renaissance in England. Parts II. and III. London: B. T. Batsford; Boston: Ticknor & Co.
Hale, Rev. E. E. The Story of Massachusetts. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Hardy, Thomas. Tess of the D'Urbervilles. Harpers.
Harte, Bret. A First Family of Tasajara. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Heine, H. Pictures of Travel. 2 vols. J. W. Lovell Co. $3.50.
Hillebrand, Karl. Zeiten, Völker und Menschen. Dritter Band. Aus und über England. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
Homan's Banker's Almanac and Register and Legal Directory. Homans Publishing Co.
Hoppin, Prof. J. M. The Early Renaissance, and Other Essays on Art Subjects. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.
Hutchinson, W. F. Under the Southern Cross: A Guide to the Sanitariums, etc., in the West Indies and Spanish Main. Providence: H. Gregory. $1.50.
James, Prof. William. Psychology. Henry Holt & Co. $1.60.
Jephson, Henry. The Platform; its Rise and Progress. 2 vols. Macmillan. $4.
Kielblock, Adolph. The Stage Fright; or, How to Face an Audience. Boston: G. H. Ellis.
Libbey, Laura J. We Parted at the Altar. Robert Bonner's Sons.
Lockwood, Mrs. S. E. H. An English Grammar for the Higher Grades in Grammar Schools. Boston: Ginn & Co. 80 cents.
Loughead, Mrs. F. H. A Crown of Thorns. San Francisco: C. A. Murdock & Co. 25 cents.
Matson, Miss Cora A. As the Cardinal Flower: Poems. Fulton, N. Y.: Fred Bennett. $1.
Molinari, G. de. Religion. Paris: Guillaumin.
Moltke's Letters to His Mother and Brothers. Harpers.
Morris, Mowbray. Montrose. [English Men of Action.] Macmillan. 60 cents.
Moule, H. C. G. Charles Simeon. London: Methuen & Co.
Müller, F. Max. Anthropological Religion. Longmans, Green & Co. $3.
Penn, I. G. The Afro-American Press and its Editors. Springfield, Mass.: Willey & Co.
Pocket-Map of Argentine Republic, Paraguay, Uruguay and Chile. Rand, McNally & Co. 50 cents.
Robinson, John. Our Trees. Salem, Mass.: N. A. Horton & Son.
Ruskin, J. The Eagle's Nest. [Brantwood Edition.] Charles E. Merrill & Co. $1.50.

JUST READY:

BRIEFER COURSE OF JAMES'S PSYCHOLOGY.

American Science Series. 12mo, pp. 478. Teacher's price, $1.60; by mail, $1.74.

This work is an abridgment and rewriting (two-fifths of the volume is either new or rewritten) by Prof. James of his 'Principles of Psychology,' and has been prepared as more directly available for the class-room than the larger book.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

Wanted.—Position in publishing-house or as editor's assistant by lady of wide experience, thoroughly trained proof reader. Competent to take full charge, from MS through the press. Refers, by permission, to John Wilson & Son, University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
ACCURATE, care *Nation*.

Ben. Butler's Book
is being delivered
TO SUBSCRIBERS.
CANVASSING AGENTS should apply to
DERBY & MILLER,
149 Church Street, New York.

Have you any Theological (Episcopal) Books you wish to sell?
If so, send word to
CROTHERS & KORTH,
BOOKSELLERS,
Room 22, 96 Fifth Avenue New York City.

Dainty Foods Demand it.

IN EVERY Receipt that calls for baking powder, use the "Royal." Better results will be obtained because it is the purest. It will make the food lighter, sweeter, of finer flavor, more digestible and wholesome. It is always reliable and uniform in its work.

I have found the Royal Baking Powder superior to all others.
C. GORJU,
Late *Chef*, Delmonico's.

A Tonic

HORSFORD'S
ACID PHOSPHATE.

A most excellent and agreeable tonic and appetizer. It nourishes and invigorates the tired brain and body, imparts renewed energy and vitality, and enlivens the functions.

Dr. EPHRAIM BATEMAN, Cedarville, N. J., says:

"I have used it for several years, not only in my practice, but in my own individual case, and consider it under all circumstances one of the best nerve tonics that we possess. For mental exhaustion or overwork it gives renewed strength and vigor to the entire system."

Descriptive pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

CAUTION: Be sure the word "Horsford's" is on the label. All others are spurious. Never sold in bulk.

"The weary brain requires some nerve sustaining element as food."—HERBERT SPENCER.

Crosby's Vitalized Phosphites.

The vital principle of animal and vegetable life isolated from the ox brain and wheat germ.

The loss of memory, the tired and exhausted feeling, the dull unrefreshed sleep, or nervous sleeplessness, brain weariness, depressed vitality, are simply the brain and nervous system calling for their necessary food. In this condition the Vitalized Phosphites give great relief. It restores the true protagon, the brain phosphoid, increases brain and nerve power by specially feeding the nerve centres. It reinvigorates brain and body.

For thirty years endorsed by leading physicians, and the world's best brain workers. Formula on the label. Pamphlet free to those who write for it. Druggists or by mail, $1.00.

F. Crosby Co.
56 WEST 25TH ST., N. Y.

FOREIGN BOOKS SENT BY MAIL, postpaid, on receipt of advertised price.
A. LEMOIGNE, Libraire Commissionaire,
12 Rue Bonaparte, Paris.

UNITARIAN PUBLICATIONS
SENT FREE.
Address Box 462, Concord, Mass.

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES and Reviews, early and recent. Correspondence solicited. A. H. ROFFE & Co., Boston, Mass.

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES and Reviews, both early and recent, *Nation* included; as also a choice collection of books and pamphlets. Catalogues free. A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, N. Y. City.

J. B. Lippincott Co.'s
New Illustrated Catalogue
OF
Works of Fiction
will be mailed free to any address on application to the Publishers,
Nos. 715 and 717 Market Street, Philadelphia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED